P

shadow of its former self. The rise of a new power, the ^ 175 Tepanec, who had as allies the vigorous but ill-established Tenochcas,* contributed to its downfall. Yet before Culhuacan succumbed completely to vassalage under the new order, members of its reigning house had twice been sought to found the lineage of Tenochtitlan.

On the documentary evidences Culhuacan was an extremely important city-state. The consecutive reigns of its chiefs stretched from the time of the fall of the western Toltec Empire to that of the rise of the important Aztec state of Tenochtitlan. Culhuacan was considered a center of civilization and for three centuries was a major power in the Valley of Mexico. Yet a visit to the modern town discloses no lofty remains, for the ancient city is razed completely. Only the temple on the Hill of the Star, which rises behind the town P and dominates the lakes, is a memorial to its past splendor. A For here took place, even after the Culhuas had lost their [796] power, the New Fire Ceremony which ushered in each new cycle of fifty-two years and epitomized the spirit of Aztec religion. P

A
Texcoco on the eastern shore of the lakes of Mexico was 175 the most civilized town in the Valley of Mexico at the time 114 • of the Conquest. Ixtlilxochitl, a descendant of the ruling house, had access to the annals of his people and left a full history, distorted though it was by his wish to make his lineage rival the noble lines of Castile; but he had a strong historical sense, doubtless absorbed from the Spanish priests P who educated him. His ancestors were a nomadic group A which lived mainly by hunting and eventually, under a chief 175 named Xolotl,† occupied the territory around Teotihuacan.

---

*Te-no'tch-cas.

†Sho'-lotle.

1:Vaillant A-5 (1928-1936)1941 NU7 Aztec NU7

361 plaza was essential for communal gatherings; the market and the principal structures, like the main temple and the chief's quarters, were situated at this point. In Tenochtitlan, which was reported to have sixty thousand fires or hearths, or figuring on the same basis as above, three hundred thousand people, additional centers existed for each clan and for the four larger districts into which the city was divided for administrative purposes.[16] (See Plate 37, top.)

● 114 We have been left a description of an Aztec city in 1524 from a Spanish monk, Fray Toribio de Benavente, called by the Indians "Motolinia," or "poor," in reference to his Franciscan simplicity of life. His firsthand observations have a fresh reality:

361 "They called these temples *teocallis*, and we found all
346 over the land that in the best part of the settlement they made a great quadrangular court, which, in the largest pueblo, was one crossbow shot from one corner to another, while in the smaller places it was not as large. This court they enclosed by a wall, many of which enclosures were with battlements; the entrances looking towards the chief highways and streets, which all terminated at the court, and even, in order to still more honor their temples, they led their roads up to these in a straight line from two and three leagues' distance. It was a wonderful aspect, to witness from the top of the chief temple, how from all the quarters and the minor places, the roadways all led up in a straight line to the courts of the *teocallis*, . . . the devil did not content himself with the aforesaid *teocallis*, but in each pueblo and in each quarter, as far as a quarter of one league off, there were other small courts containing, sometimes only one, sometimes three or four *teocallis*. . . ."[17]

1:Vaillant A-5 (1928-1936)1941 NU7 Aztec NU7

NOTES

CHAPTER I

J14 The recent dates of authorities cited indicate how rapidly ideas on the genesis of Indian culture are changing. New finds, new conclusions, new datings, appear each year. The summary in Chapter I is frankly interpretative, and no one will be more ready than the author to change his views as fresh evidence appears. The four works listed here: Swanton Essays; Maya and Their Neighbors; Wissler, American Indian, and Means, Ancient Empires, give a broad background for New World archaeology. Their detailed references are listed under their appropriate footnote number. The full titles of the four background volumes are:

Essays in Historical Anthropology of North America. Published in honor of John R. Swanton (Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections, Vol. 100, Washington, 1940).

The Maya and Their Neighbors, New York, 1940.

Means, Philip, Ancient Empires of the Andes, New York, 1931.

Wissler, Clark, The American Indian, New York, 3rd ed., 1938.

[1] Howells, Origins, 1940. Nelson, Antiquity of Man, 1933. MacCurdy, ed., Early Man, 1937. Howard, Evidence of Early Man, 1935.

[2] Wissler, American Indian, 1938.

[3] Howells, Origins, 1940. Hooton, Racial Types, 1933. Dixon, Racial History of Man, 1923. Hrdlicka, Origin and Antiquity of American Indian, 1923.

[4] Nelson, Antiquity of Man, 1933. Roberts, Pre-Pottery Horizon, 1940. Howard, Evidence of Early Man, 1935. Bird, Antiquity and Migrations, 1938.

[5] Wissler, American Indian, 1938. Swanton Essays, 1940. Kroeber, Cultural and Natural Areas, 1939.

[6] Gladwin, Snaketown, II, 1937. Sayles, Survey of Texas, 1935.

[7] Kroeber, Cultural and Natural Areas, 1939.

[8] Sauer, American Agricultural Origins, 1936. Yanovski, Food Plants, 1936. Mangelsdorf and Reeves, Origin of Maize, 1938.

[9] Wissler, American Indian, 1938.

[10] Linton, Crops, Soils and Culture, 1940.

[11] Roberts, Survey of Southwestern Archaeology, 1935. Kidder, Intro-

114 duction to Southwestern Archaeology, 1924. Gladwin and Others, Snaketown, I and II, 1937.

[12] Spinden, Ancient Civilizations, 1928. Means, Ancient Empires, 1931. Vaillant, Early Cultures, 1935.

[13] Means, Ancient Empires, 1931.

[14] Spinden, Ancient Civilizations, 1928. Spinden, Maya Art, 1913.

[15] Linton, Crops, Soil and Culture, 1940. Vaillant, Patterns in Culture, 1940.

[16] Spinden, Ancient Civilizations, 1928. Vaillant, Early Cultures, 1935.

[17] Vaillant, Patterns in Culture, 1940.

[18] Spinden, Ancient Civilizations, 1928.

[19] Gann and Thompson, History of the Maya, 1931. The Maya and Their Neighbors, 1940. Thompson, Civilization of the Mayas, 1932.

[20] Morley, Introduction to Maya Hieroglyphs, 1915. Spinden, Reduction of Mayan Dates, 1924. Teeple, Maya Astronomy, 1931. Thompson, Maya Chronology, 1935. Andrews, Chronology and Astronomy, 1940.

[21] Donnelly, Atlantis, 1882. Le Plongeon, Queen Moo, 1896. Churchward, Lost Continent of Mu, 1926.

[22] Vaillant, Chronology and Stratigraphy, 1935. Gann, Mounds in Northern Honduras, 1900. Tozzer, Maya and Toltec Figures, 1930. Bancroft, Native Races, 1883. Butler, Alta Vera Paz, 1940.

[23] Stirling, Great Stone Faces, 1940; Initial Series from Vera Cruz, 1940; Oldest Dated Work, 1939. Weiant, Manuscript, 1939. Vaillant, Bearded Mystery, 1931; Pre-Columbian Jade, 1932. Ricketson and Ricketson, Uaxactun, 1937. Caso, Exploraciones, 1931–32, 1934–35, 1936–37. Holmes, Nephrite Statue, 1907.

[24] Batres, Exploraciones en Monte Alban, 1902. Caso, Exploraciones, 1934–35, 1936–37. Dauterman, Pottery Yard Stick, 1938.

[25] Vaillant, Correlation, 1938.

CHAPTER II

There are no really popular accounts of the Middle Cultures. Dr Spinden's excellent Ancient Civilization of Mexico and Central America sketches a broad outline; the author's Early Cultures sums up the results of the most recent excavations. The Middle Cultures are at that stage where technical studies have made great progress, but the subject matter has not passed into the hands of social and historical thinkers for intellectual rather than technical appraisal.

[1] POPULAR: Vaillant, Threshold of Civilization, 1929; Beginnings of a History, 1930. Beyer, Antiguedades del Pedregal, 1917.

TECHNICAL: Cummings, Ruins of Cuicuilco, 1923; Cuicuilco, 1923; Cuicuilco, 1926; Cuicuilco, 1933. Gamio, Excavaciones del Pedregal, 1920. Kroeber, Archaic Culture Horizons, 1925. Vaillant, Zacatenco, 1930; Ticoman, 1931; El Arbolillo, 1935; Early Cultures, 1935. Vaillant and Vaillant, Gualupita, 1934.

[2] Vaillant, Early Cultures, 1935.

[3] Vaillant, Early Cultures, 1935.

1:Vaillant A-5 (1928-1936)1941 NU7 Aztec NU7

[4] Vaillant, Prehistoric Cotton, 1939.

[5] Vaillant, El Arbolillo, 1935.

[6] Vaillant, El Arbolillo, 1935.

[7] Cummings, Cuicuilco, 1933. Noguera, Teotihuacan, 1935. Vaillant, Ticoman, 1931. Vaillant and Vaillant, Gualupita, 1934.

[8] Linné, Teotihuacan, 1934, pp. 162–67.

[9] Vaillant and Vaillant, Gualupita, 1934.

[10] Vaillant and Vaillant, Gualupita, 1934. Stirling, Stone Faces, 1940.

[11] Cummings, Cuicuilco, 1923a, 1923b, 1926, 1933.

[12] Cummings, Cuicuilco, 1933. Mena and Hyde, Antiguedad del Hombre, 1922. Nuttall, Aztecs and Their Predecessors, 1926.

[13] Kidder, Introduction, 1924, pp. 16–35; Pottery, I, 1931. Vaillant, El Arbolillo, 1935, pp. 160–67.

[14] Vaillant, Early Cultures, 1935.

CHAPTER III

The so-called Toltec question is covered by an enormous speculative literature and a relatively small number of reports on excavations scientifically carried out. The extensive work of the Swedish archaeologist Linné has appeared in part only, and much of the modern Mexican work and the results of the writer's excavations have not yet reached print. The interpretation given here explains a number of features, but further work will correct and expand many of these opinions.

[1] Brinton, Essays, 1890, pp. 83–100.

[2] Ixtlilxochitl, Relaciones, 1891; this sixteenth-century writer is underestimated. He was a descendant of the old Texcocan lineage and had access to many of the ancient records.

[3] Anales de Cuauhtitlan, 1885; Historia Tolteca-Chichimeca, 1937, and Muñoz Camargo, 1892, describe these later lineages. The great writer on customs and religion, Father Bernadino Sahagun, was confused by this double usage. History was difficult for him, while ethnology was an open book.

[4] Ixtlilxochitl, Relaciones, 1891; Historia Chichimeca, 1892. Bancroft, Native Races, 1883, Vol. 5. This historian is a veritable mine of information, but he worked from written records without the archaeological check accessible to modern students. Krickeberg, Alten Kulturen Mittel-Amerikas, 1937, an excellent summary of current and past interpretation of history. Beyer, in Gamio, Teotihuacan, 1922. Vaillant, Correlation, 1938, an effort to tie in historical with archaeological information in the Valley of Mexico.

[5] Caso, Conocimiento del Tonalpohualli, 1937.

[6] Sahagun, Historia General, 1938, Vol. 1, Book 1, p. 8; Vol. 2, Book 8, Chap. 5; Vol. 3, Book 10, Chap. 29, paragraph 1, 12. Anales de Cuauhtitlan, 1885. Ixtlilxochitl, Relaciones, 1891.

[7] Ixtlilxochitl, Relaciones, 1891. Anales de Cuauhtitlan, 1885. Bancroft, Native Races, Vol. 5, 1883.

114

[8] Linné, Teotihuacan, 1934, the best English work on Teotihuacan. Gamio, ed., Teotihuacan, 1922, the three-volume Mexican study on the archaeology, history and sociology of modern and ancient Teotihuacan. Charnay, Ancient Cities, 1888, an early account of the ruins and some excavations. Seler, Teotihuacan-Kultur, 1915, the standard scholarly work on this culture, now outdated by Gamio and Linné.

[9] Noguera, Antecedegtes de la Cultura Teotihuacana, 1935, the single exhaustive study on this epoch.

[10] Linné, Teotihuacan, 1934.

[11] Linné, Teotihuacan, 1934.

[12] Chavero, Monolito de Coatlinchan, 1903.

[13] Linné, Teotihuacan, 1934; Expedition to Mexico, 1936.

[14] These Cholula excavations are still incomplete and reports on them unpublished.

[15] Morris, Charlot and Morris, Temple of the Warriors, 1928.

[16] Nuttall, Teotihuacan, unpublished; cf. Noguera, Conclusiones, 1937.

[17] Seler, Teotihuacan-Kultur, 1915. Tozzer, Santiago Ahuitzotla, 1921, a complete study of a building. Vaillant, Correlation, 1938.

CHAPTER IV

This era is just emerging from darkness and confusion. Recent definition of the Mazapan culture reinforces Dr Tozzer's work at Coyotlatelco by giving archaeological checks on the annals.

The writer's suggested identification of ceremonial dumps helps to clarify the confusion in the annals. The author believes the new finds corroborate Orozco y Berra's correlation of tribal rulers, but the late Dr Lehmann's exhaustive research does not agree. New data, worked out from newly discovered documents by Wigberto Jimenez Moreno, will clarify the picture when published fully.

[1] Joyce, *Mexican* Archaeology, 1914, gives a straightforward interpretation. Anales de Cuauhtitlan, 1885. Relacion de Genealogia and Origen de los Mexicanos are abridgments of the Anales de Cuauhtitlan. Lehmann, Geschichte von Colhuacan und Mexiko, 1939, is a careful, analytical translation of the Annals of Cuauhtitlan. Orozco y Berra, Ojeada de Cronologia, 1878, is a useful critique. Kirchhoff, Pueblos, 1940, is important for interpretation of annals. Vaillant, Correlation, 1938, gives a résumé of the basis of this chapter.

[2] Ixtlilxochitl, Historia Chichimeca, 1892. Mapa Quinatzin, Mapa Tlotzin, Codex Xolotl; important picture manuscripts for this period.

[3] Codex Ramirez, Historia de los Mexicanos, in Radin, Sources, 1920. Codex Boturini, Codex of 1576; picture manuscripts.

[4] Bancroft, Native Races, Vol. 5, 1883, Chaps. V–VII cites early authorities. Orozco y Berra, Historia Antigua, 1880, cites early authorities and picture writings. Radin, Sources, 1920, an invaluable series of translations of early Mexican records.

[5] Vaillant, Correlation, 1938. Linné, Teotihuacan, 1934; Mazapan Grave, 1938.

[6] Vaillant, Chronology and Stratigraphy, 1935. Butler, Alta Vera Paz, 1940.

[7] Tozzer, Santiago Ahuitzotla, 1921. Boas, Album, 1911–12. Noguera, in Tenayuca, 1935.

[8] Boas, Album, 1911–12, Pls. 1–10. Gamio, Texto, 1921. Brenner, Influence of Technique in Culhuacan, 1931.

[9] Vaillant, Correlation, 1938; History and Stratigraphy, 1937.

[10] Marquina, Reygadas Vertiz and Noguera, in Tenayuca, 1935.

[11] Noguera, Altar de los Craneos, 1937; Conclusiones, 1937.

[12] Preuss and Mengin, Historia Tolteca-Chichimeca, 1937. Lehmann, Geschichte von Colhuacan und Mexiko, 1937. Muñoz Camargo, Historia, 1892. Sahagun, Historia General, 1938, Vol. 3, Book 10, Chapter XXIX. Bancroft, Native Races, Vol. 5, Chapters XI–XIII.

CHAPTER V

The picture is much clearer for Aztec times; the archaeology is better known, and the historical records are more in accord. The cyclical constructions and destructions of the Aztecs are especially helpful. A confusing point is the foundation date of Tenochtitlan, for which the author provides a theory.

[1] Exhaustive accounts of Aztec history: Bancroft, Native Races, 1883, Vol. 5; Orozco y Berra, Historia Antigua, 1880.

Popular English digests: Thompson, Mexico before Cortes, 1933; Joyce, Mexican Archaeology, 1914. Radin, Sources, 1922, gives translations and reproductions of important native sources, as well as a superb critical analysis.

Other Sources: Torquemada, Monarquia, 1723; Clavigero, History of Mexico, 1783.

Picture writings: the codices of 1560, 1590, Boturini, Mendoza, Siguenza, Telleriano-Remensis, Vaticanus A, Tepechpan.

Digests of picture writings in Spanish and Nahuatl: Anales de Cuauhtitlan, 1885; Chimalpahin, Anales, 1889; Codex Ramirez, 1878; Tezozomoc's Cronica, 1878; Histoire Mexicaine, 1891; Historia de los Mexicanos, 1886; Ixtlilxochitl, Historia Chichimeca, 1892; Duran, Historia de las Indias, 1867, 1880.

Tenayuca, 1935, is the great work of the Department of Monuments of the Mexican Ministry of Public Education, which blends archaeology and history in a masterly exposition of the Aztec past.

[2] Codex Boturini.

[3] Historia de los Mexicanos.

[4] Anales de Cuauhtitlan, 1885, p. 49, Year 8 Rabbit. Palacios, Fundacion de Mexico, 1925, résumé of historical evidence for founding of Mexico. Codex of 1590 shows Acamapichtli being crowned by the chief of Tlaltelolco in the presence of the Tenochca clan council; cf. Vaillant, Correlation, 1938, p. 563.

[5] Sahagun, Historia General, 1938, Vol. 3, Book 10, Chap. XXIX, pp. 137–38.

[6] Bancroft, Native Races, 1883, Vol. 5, quotes early authorities on pp. 414–15.

[7] Bancroft, Native Races, 1883, Vol. 5, p. 434; Tezozomoc, Chapter LIV. Duran, Historia de las Indians, I, 1867, Chapter XXXII.

[8] Tezozomoc, Cronica, 1878, Chapters XLI–XLII.

[9] Tezozomoc, Cronica, 1872, Chapter LI. Duran, Historia de las Indias, I, 1867, Chapter XXXVI.

[10] Ixtlilxochitl, Historia Chichimeca, 1892.

[11] Bancroft, Native Races, 1883, p. 449, quotes Torquemada, Clavigero and Ixtlilxochitl.

[12] Saville, Tizoc, 1929.

[13] Bancroft, Native Races, 1883, pp. 439–40, quotes Ixtlilxochitl, Duran, Torquemada and Codex Telleriano-Remensis.

[14] Bancroft, Native Races, 1883, p. 471, quotes Tezozomoc, Torquemada and Duran.

[15] Bancroft, Native Races, 1883, p. 507, quotes Ixtlilxochitl.

[16] Diaz del Castillo, True History, 1908–16. Cortes, Letters, 1908.

CHAPTER VI

The customs of the Aztecs were a source of great interest to the conquerors and their palliative companions, the friars. The system of controlling the conquered depended on knowledge of the native methods of life. Consequently there is a full literature based on contemporary reports sent back to Spain by her civil and ecclesiastical administrators in the new colony.

[1] Excellent popular accounts: Thompson, Mexico before Cortes, 1933; Biart, The Aztecs, 1883; Joyce, Mexican Archaeology, 1914; Prescott, Conquest of Mexico, 1922.

Exhaustive English studies: Bandelier, Social Organization, 1880; Bancroft, Native Races, 1883, Vols. 2 and 5.

Mexican study: Orozco y Berra, Historia Antigua, 1880.

Best contemporary accounts: Sahagun, Historia General, 1938; Pomar, Relacion, 1891; Zurita, Breve Relacion, 1891; Motolinia, Historia, 1914; Torquemada, Monarquia, 1723; Clavigero, History of Mexico, 1787.

Picture writings: Codex Mendoza, Codex Florentino (illustrations for Sahagun's Historia General).

The transition from the tribal council to the domination of the chiefs is shown by the presence of individual members in the early times and their disappearance after the foundation of the lineage; cf. Vaillant, Correlation, 1938, pp. 563–64; Bandelier, Social Organization, 1880, pp. 576–88; Mapa de Siguenza, Codex of 1590; Histoire Mexicaine; Codex Mendoza, and Codex Telleriano-Remensis.

[2] Codex Mendoza; Sahagun, Historia General, 1938, Vol. 2, Book 6.

[3] Bandelier, Social Organization, 1880, cites early authorities.

[4] Bandelier, Social Organization, 1880; Bancroft, Native Races, 1883, Vol. 2.

[5] Codex Mendoza.

1:Vaillant A-5 (1928-1936)1941 NU7 Aztec NU7

[6] Bandelier, Social Organization, 1880; cf. Waterman, Bandelier's Contribution, 1917, for a critique of Bandelier.

[7] Sahagun, Historia General, 1938, Vol. 1, Book 3, Appendix; Vol. 2, Books 6, 9; Vol. 3, Book 10; see also Codex Florentino and Codex Mendoza.

[8] Bancroft, Native Races, 1883, Vol. 2; Bandelier, Social Organization, 1880.

[9] Ceballos Novelo, Instituciones, 1935. Kohler, Derecho de los Aztecas, 1924. Moreno, Organizacion de las Aztecas, 1931.

CHAPTER VII

This aspect of life is fully covered in the contemporary literature of the Conquest.

[1] POPULAR AUTHORS: Thompson, Mexico before Cortes, 1931; Joyce, Mexican Archaeology, 1914; Biart, The Aztecs, 1883.

EXHAUSTIVE ENGLISH STUDIES: Bandelier, Tenure of Lands, 1878; Bancroft, Native Races, 1883.

EXHAUSTIVE MEXICAN STUDY: Orozco y Berra, Historia Antigua, 1880.

CONTEMPORARY ACCOUNTS: Sahagun, Historia General, 1938; Torquemada, Monarquia, 1723; Clavigero, History of Mexico, 1787.

PICTURE WRITINGS: Codex Florentino (illustrations for Sahagun's Historia General), Codex Mendoza, Tribute Roll of Montezuma.

[2] Bandelier, Tenure of Lands, 1878.

[3] Mapa Tlotzin. Cortes, Letters, 1908, p. 221, referring to Valley of Puebla, "Such is the multitude of people who live in these parts that there is not a palm of land which is not cultivated . . . many places they suffer for want of bread."

[4] Nuttall, Mexican Gardens, 1925.

[5] Bandelier, Tenure of Land, 1878.

[6] Tribute Roll of Montezuma, Codex Mendoza, Tribute Roll.

[7] Articles on Shell and Commerce in Hodge, Handbook, 1907, Lumholtz, Unknown Mexico, 1902, plumbate ware in Tepic. Lothrop, Coclé, 1937, gold in Yucatan.

[8] Diaz del Castillo, True History, 1908–16, Chapter XCII. McBryde, Solola, 1933.

[9] Blom, Commerce of the Maya, 1932.

[10] Nuttall, Chalchihuitl, 1901. Diaz del Castillo, True History, 1908–16, Chapter CXXVIII.

[11] Saville, Goldsmith's Art, 1920. Sahagun, Historia General, 1938, Vol. 5, pp. 193–219.

[12] Sahagun, Historia General, 1938, Vol. 3, Book 11. Emmart, Badianus Manuscript, 1940. Sauer, Agricultural Origins, 1936. Hernandez, Historia Plantarum, 1790. Spinden, Ancient Civilizations, 1928.

[13] Alcocer, Comidas, 1938.

[14] Bancroft, Native Races, 1883, Vol. 2, pp. 160–74, 553–74; cites authorities.

[15] Vaillant, Twilight of Aztecs, 1938.

1:Vaillant A-5 (1928-1936)1941 NU7 Aztec NU7

d114

[16] Anonymous Conqueror, 1917, narrative.

[17] Motolinia, Historia, 1914, Book 1, Chapter XII; Bandelier's translation in Art of War, 1877, p. 104.

[18] Bernal Dias, True History, 1908–16, Chapter XCII, p. 72.

[19] Bancroft, Native Races, 1883, Vol. 2, pp. 553–74; cites authorities on temple architecture. Tenayuca, 1935. Marquina, Estudio Arquitectonico, 1928.

[20] Codex Mendoza, Codex Florentino. Seler, Altmexikanischer Schmuck, 1904. Peñafiel, Indumentaria Antigua, 1903.

CHAPTER VIII

There are abundant data on crafts and craftsmanship to be drawn from the contemporary authorities and from museum collections. Examples of the textile art, however, are conspicuously lacking, since few fabrics have survived natural disintegration or have survived from collections made by the Conquistadors. Pictures in the manuscripts do give the impression, nonetheless, that this art was on a par with the others.

[1] Popular English digests are found in Thompson, Mexico before Cortes, 1935; Joyce, Mexican Archaeology, 1922, Maya and Mexican Art, 1927; Spinden, Ancient Civilizations, 1928; Vaillant, Artists and Craftsmen, 1935.

Serious special studies: Saville, Goldsmith's Art, 1920; Turquoise Mosaic Art, 1922; Woodcarver's Art, 1925.

[2] Saville, Onyx Jar, 1900. Holmes, Handbook, 1919. Nuttall, Penitential Rite, 1904.

[3] Holmes, Masterpieces of Aboriginal Art, 1914–19.

[4] Mason, Mirrors, 1927.

[5] Saville, Onyx Jar, 1900. Holmes, Handbook, 1919.

[6] Sahagun, Historia General, 1938. Peñafiel, Indumentaria Antigua, 1903. Codex Mendoza, Codex Magliabecchiano, Tribute Roll of Montezuma.

[7] Nuttall, Feather Work, 1895; Standard or Headdress, 1888. Seler, Feather Ornaments, 1904. Sahagun, Historia General, 1938. Codex Florentino.

[8] Saville, Turquoise Mosaic Art, 1922.

[9] Holmes, Archaeological Studies, 1895. Saville, Cruciform Structures, 1909.

[10] Saville, Woodcarver's Art, 1925.

[11] Saville, Goldsmith's Art, 1920. Sahagun, Historia General, 1938, Vol. 5, orfebreria.

[12] Caso, Monte Alban, 1932; Reading the Riddle, 1932.

[13] Lothrop, Coclé, 1937.

[14] Noguera, Decorative Aspects of Pottery, 1930; Caracteristicas de la Ceramica, 1930; in Tenayuca, 1935. Boas, Album, 1911–12. Brenner, Influence of Technique, 1931. Vaillant, History and Stratigraphy, 1937; Correlation, 1938, Figs. 3 and 4.

[15] Boas, Album, 1911–12, Pls. 1–10.

[16] Boas, Album, 1911–12, Pls. 11–24

1:Vaillant A-5 (1928-1936)1941 NU7 Aztec NU7

114

[17] Boas, Album, 1911–12, Pls. 25–31.

[18] Noguera, in Tenayuca, 1935, Pls. 58; Ceramica del Templo Mayor, 1934.

[19] Vaillant, History and Stratigraphy, 1937. Noguera, in Tenayuca, 1935.

[20] Vaillant, Correlation, 1938, Figs. 2 and 5-x.

[21] Noguera, Ladrillo como Material, 1928; Tizatlan, 1927.

CHAPTER IX

The study of Middle American art is in its infancy. We are only just realizing, in this and other American fields, the great contribution which the Indian has made. There are few publications dedicated especially to this purpose. I am including under footnote 1 a few books which cover the field of American Indian Art.

[1] North America: Douglas and d'Harnoncourt, Indian Art, 1940. Vaillant, Indian Arts, 1939.

Middle America: Caso, Thirteen Masterpieces, 1938; Twenty Centuries of Mexican Art, 1940. Cahill, American Sources, 1933. Holmes, Masterpieces, 1914–19. Marquina, Estudio Arquitectonico, 1928. Escultura Mexicana Antigua, 1934. Spinden, Maya Art, 1913. Totten, Maya Architecture, 1926. Vaillant, Artists and Craftsmen, 1935.

South America: Lehmann and Doering, Kunstgeschichte des Peru, 1924. Nordenskiöld, Archéologie de L'Amazon, 1930.

[2] Marquina, Estudio Arquitectonico, 1928. Tenayuca, 1935. Holmes, Archaeological Studies, 1895–97. Vaillant, Artists and Craftsmen, 1935.

[3] Cummings, Cuicuilco, 1933.

[4] Gamio, Teotihuacan, 1922.

[5] Noguera, Altar de los Craneos, 1937.

[6] Tenayuca, 1935. Saville, Tepoztlan, 1896. Seler, Tepoztlan, 1904. Larsen, Malinalco, 1938. Marquina, Estudio Arquitectonico, 1928. Pollock, Round Temples, 1936.

[7] Pollock, Round Temples, 1936.

[8] Gallop, Ancient Monuments, 1938. Larsen, Malinalco, 1938.

[9] Vaillant, Artists and Craftsmen, 1935.

[10] Vaillant, Artists and Craftsmen, 1935.

[11] Spinden, Ancient Civilizations, 1928.

[12] Caso, El Teocalli, 1927.

[13] Saville, Tizoc, 1929.

[14] Caso, Reading the Riddle, 1932. Compare the Mixtec Codices Cospi, Vaticanus B, Borgia, with the Aztec Codices Telleriano-Remensis and Borbonicus.

[15] Goldsmith's Art, 1920; Turquoise Mosaic Art, 1922; Woodcarver's Art, 1925.

[16] Caso, Tizatlan, 1927. Vaillant, Artists and Craftsmen, 1935.

[17] Pre-Conquest manuscripts: Codex Borbonicus, Codex Boturini, Tonalamatl Aubin.

Post-Conquest manuscripts: Codex Telleriano-Remensis, Codex Vaticanus A, Codex of 1576, Codex of 1590, Manuscrit Mexicaine.

1:Vaillant A-5 (1928-1936)1941 NU7 Aztec NU7

114 Post-Conquest drawings to Spanish order: Codex Mendoza, Codex Florentino, Lienzo de Tlaxcala.

[18] Castañeda, Pequeños Percutores, 1933.

[19] Codex Borbonicus.

[20] Orozço y Berra, Historia Antigua, 1880. Spinden, Ancient Civilizations, 1928. For oratory, Sahagun, Historia General, 1938, Vol. II, Book 6. Brinton, Ancient Nahuatl Poetry, 1887.

CHAPTER X

Aztec religion is a fascinating and confusing subject. Ritualism ran wild, and the early Spanish observers, trained in rigorous Christian theology, found the subject interesting but baffling. Sahagun is far and away the best contemporary source. He checked his data in three different localities and spent many years in the process. The late Eduard Seler was the great modern authority, bringing a philosophical background to aid a meticulous interest in ritual. Spence, the best English writer, was his disciple, as was the infinitely learned Hermann Beyer. Alfonso Caso, the distinguished Mexican scholar, has combined brilliantly the meticulousness of the German school with the long-continued Mexican tradition, passed on by many sympathetic and learned minds. Among modern American students J. Eric Thompson is outstanding.

[1] Popular English accounts: Thompson, Mexico before Cortes, 1933. Spinden, Ancient Civilizations, 1928. Caso, Aztec Religion, 1937.

More detailed studies: Bancroft, Native Races, 1883, Vol. III, Spence, Gods of Mexico, 1923, standard text. Mrs Bandelier's translation of Sahagun, Historia General, Books 1–4, 1932.

Foreign language: Beuchat, Manuel d'Archeologie Americaine, 1912. Caso, El Teocalli, 1927. Paso y Troncoso, Descripcion del Codice Pictorico, 1898. Seler, Gesammelte Abhandlungen, 1902–23; Commentaries on Codices Borgia, 1904–09, Fejervary-Mayer, 1901–02, Vaticanus B, 1902, and Tonalamatl Aubin, 1900–01.

[2] Caso, El Teocalli, 1927. Spence, Gods of Mexico, 1923. Official version of Calendar Stone.

[3] At Teotihuacan, Azcapotzalco, Culhuacan.

[4] Spence, Gods of Mexico, 1923.

[5] Spence, Gods of Mexico, 1923.

[6] Spence, Gods of Mexico, 1923.

[7] For definitions of gods: Caso, Aztec Religion, 1927; Spence, Gods of Mexico, 1923; Seler, Commentaries.

[8] Bandelier, Archaeological Tour, 1884.

[9] For further definitions: Caso, Religion Azteca, 1938; El Teocalli, 1928. Spence, Gods of Mexico, 1923. Seler, Commentaries.

CHAPTER XI

The religious organization of the Aztecs is relatively clear. The ritual and the identification of deities is much more perplexing, as a certain

1:Vaillant A-5 (1928-1936)1941 NU7 Aztec NU7

amount of interpretation is involved. The working of the calendar has puzzled many a distinguished scholar, but its main principles are known. So elaborate a system of worship must have led to considerable local variation, so the student need not too greatly despair over the lack of agreement among authorities. The methods of pictographic writing are well known.

[1] POPULAR ACCOUNTS: Thompson, Mexico before Cortes, 1933; Joyce, Mexican Archaeology, 1921; Spinden, Ancient Civilizations, 1928.

MORE DETAILED STUDIES: *for the priesthood:* Bandelier, Social Organization, 1880; *for ritual:* Spence, Gods of Mexico, 1923; Seler, Commentaries, 1900–09; Bancroft, Native Races, 1883, Vols. 1, 3; Del Paso y Troncoso, Codice Pictorico, 1898; Beuchat, Manuel, 1911; Robelo, Diccionario de Mitologia, 1905; *for calendar:* Caso, Correlacion, 1939; De Jonghe, Le Calendrier Mexicaine, 1906; Orozco y Berra, Historia Antigua, 1880; Palacios, Fundacion de Mexico-Tenochtitlan, 1925; Seler, in Bulletin 28, 1904; Gesammelte Abhandlungen, 1902–23; Spence, Gods of Mexico, 1923; Spinden, Indian Manuscripts, 1933; Diffusion of Maya Astronomy, 1940; *for writing:* Aubin, Memoires sur la Peinture, 1885; Orozco y Berra, Historia Antigua, 1880; Peñafiel, Nombres Geograficos, 1885; Nomenclatura Geografica, 1895.

CONTEMPORARY: Sahagun, Historia General, 1938; Codex Florentino; Torquemada, Monarquia, 1923.

[2] Bandelier, Social Organization, 1880; cites early authorities.

[3] Thompson, Mexico before Cortes, 1933; Beuchat, Manuel, 1911; De Jonghe, Calendrier Mexicaine, 1906; Spence, Gods of Mexico, 1923; Spinden, Indian Manuscripts, 1933; Diffusion of Maya Astronomy, 1940; Caso, Correlacion, 1940; Morley, Introduction to Maya Hieroglyphs, 1915; Orozco y Berra, Historia Antigua, 1880; Seler, in Bulletin 28, 1904; Commentaries on Codex Vaticanus B, Fejervary-Mayer, Borgia, and Tonalamatl of Aubin Collection, 1900–09.

[4] Seler, Commentaries on Tonalamatl Aubin, Codex Fejervary-Mayer, Codex Vaticanus B; Paso y Troncoso, Codice Pictorica (Borbonicus).

[5] AZTEC RECORDS: Tonalamatl Aubin, Codex Borbonicus, Codex Florentino, Codex Telleriano-Remensis, Vaticanus A.

MIXTECA-PUEBLA RECORDS: Vaticanus B, Borgia, Bologna (Cospi).

[6] Caso, Correlacion, 1940; Duran, Historia de las Indias, II, 1880; Sahagun, Historia General, 1938; Codex Borbonicus; Beuchat, Manuel, 1911.

[7] De Jonghe, Calendrier Mexicaine, 1906. Codex Mariano Jimenez. Sahagun, Historia General, 1938. Fewkes, Central American Ceremony, p. 285, 1893.

[8] Seler, Venus Period, 1904.

[9] Bancroft, Native Races, 1883, Vol. 3, pp. 393–96; cites authorities.

[10] Duran, Historia, II, 1880, pp. 155–60.

[11] Linton, Pawnee Sacrifice, 1926. Wissler and Spinden, Pawnee Sacrifice, 1916.

[12] Bancroft, Native Races, 1883, Vol. 3, pp. 387–88.

[13] Sahagun, Historia General, 1938; Codex Florentino.

[14] Bancroft, Native Races, 1883, Vol. 3, pp. 422–25. Blom, Maya Ball

1:Vaillant A-5 (1928-1936)1941 NU7 Aztec NU7

114

Game, 1932. Duran, Historia de las Indias, II, 1880, Vol. 2, Chapter CI. Oviedo, Historia General, 1851, Vol. I, p. 165.

[15] Caso, Patolli, 1927.

[16] Clavigero, Historia Antigua, 1787, Book 7, Section 46. Larsen, Volador, 1937.

[17] Bancroft, Native Races, 1883, Vols. 2 and 3. Nuttall, Penitential Rite, 1904.

[18] Codex Borbonicus for monthly ceremonies.

Telleriano-Remensis and copy Vaticanus A record this sacrifice in year 8 Reed (1487).

Bancroft, Native Races, 1883, Vol. 2, pp. 585–86; cites authors.

[19] Orozco y Berra, Historia Antigua, 1880; Spinden, Ancient Civilizations, 1928; Peñafiel, Nomenclatura, 1897; Nombres Geograficos, 1885; Codex Mendoza; Tribute Roll of Montezuma.

[20] Memorial de Tepetlaostoc.

[21] Chimalpahin, Anales, 1889, Introduction, pp. vii–viii.

[22] TEXCOCAN STYLE: Mapa Tlotzin, Mapa Quinatzin, Codex Xolotl, Mapa de Siguenza.

TENOCHCAN STYLE: Codices Boturini, 1576, 1590, Telleriano-Remensis, Vaticanus A, Historia Mexicaine, Mapa de Tepechpan.

[23] Sahagun, Historia General, 1938, Vol. 3, Book 10, Chapter XXIX, pp. 137–38, paragraph 12.

[24] Codex Mendoza, Tribute Roll of Montezuma.

[25] Lienzo Chalchiuhtzin Vasquez, in Vaillant, Aztec Twilight, 1939. Boban, Documents, 1891. Tlaquiltenango Manuscript, in American Museum of Natural History.

[26] Tozzer, Value of Manuscripts, 1912. Boban, Documents, 1891.

CHAPTER XII

The post-Conquest native historians approached Aztec history from an annalistic point of view. Only occasionally did economic and political ideas enter in. Bancroft's and Orozco y Berra's recapitulations of the early history give fullest materials for a detailed scrutiny of Aztec foreign affairs and war. Bandelier's technical study of their method of warfare is the best general outline of Aztecan procedure in this field.

[1] Bancroft, Native Races, 1883. Orozco y Berra, Historia de la Conquista, 1880. Bandelier, Art of War, 1877.

OLDER AUTHORITIES: Duran, Historia, 1867, 1880; Ixtlilxochitl, Relaciones, 1891, Historia, 1892; Tezozomoc, Cronica, 1878; Torquemada, Monarquia, 1723; Clavigero, History of Mexico, 1787.

[2] Mapa Tlotzin.

[3] Ixtlilxochitl, Historia Chichimeca, 1892.

[4] Commentary of Hamy in Codex Telleriano-Remensis. Aragon, Expansion del Imperio Mexicano, 1931.

[5] Bancroft, Native Races, Vol. 5; cites versions of various authorities.

[6] Bandelier, Art of War, 1877.

[7] Diaz del Castillo, True History, 1908, Vol. 1, Chapter IX, p. 43; Chapter XX, p. 74; Chapter XXIII, p. 85.

[8] Codex Mendoza.
[9] Bandelier, Art of War, 1877.
[10] Bandelier, Art of War, 1877.
[11] Vaillant, Correlation, 1938, footnote 81. Codex Mendoza.
[12] Bancroft, Native Races, 1883, Vol. 2, pp. 603–23.

CHAPTER XIII

This chapter was adapted from Natural History, Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 17–30, January–February, 1933. It is based on contemporary accounts of Tenochtitlan and on various later archaeological studies on the topography of Tenochtitlan, the ancient Mexico City.

[1] CONTEMPORARY ACCOUNTS: Cortes, Letters, 1908; Diaz del Castillo, True History, 1908–16; Anonymous Conqueror, 1917; Mendieta, Historia Ecclesiastica, 1870; Motolinia, Historia de las Indias, 1914; Sahagun, Historia General, 1938, Vol. 4, Book 12; Codex Florentino.

LATER STUDIES: Prescott, Conquest of Mexico, 1922; Maudslay, Great Temple Enclosures, 1912; Peñafiel, Destruccion del Templo Mayor, 1910; Alcocer, Mexico-Tenochtitlan, 1935; Maps reproduced in Maudslay's edition of Bernal Diaz del Castillo, True History, 1908–16, Vol. 3: Plan on Maguey Paper, Map of 1524, Map of Alonso de Santa Cruz, 1560.

[2] Diaz del Castillo, True History, 1908–16, Vol. 2, Chapter LXXXVIII.

[3] Diaz del Castillo, True History, 1908–16, Vol. 2, Chapter XCII.

CHAPTER XIV

Prescott has unforgettably told the story of the Conquest of Mexico. This chapter seeks to stress the Indian side of the Conquest, as told by Sahagun, Duran and others and as illustrated in the Codex Florentino and the Lienzo de Tlaxcala. The latter was prepared as a memorial to show the services Tlaxcalan warriors rendered the cause of Spain. This chapter is adapted from Natural History, Vol. 39, No. 3, pp. 185–95, March, 1937.

[1] Prescott, Conquest of Mexico, 1922. Orozco y Berra, Historia Antigua, 1880. Cortes, Letters, 1908. Diaz del Castillo, True History, 1908–16. Anonymous Conqueror, 1917. Duran, Historia, 1867, 1880. Ixtlilxochitl, Horribles Crueldades, 1829. Sahagun, Historia General, 1938, Vol. 4, Book 12. Codex Florentino. Lienzo de Tlaxcala.

[2] Sahagun, Historia General, 1938, Vol. 4, Book 12, Chapter I. Codex Florentino.

[3] Sahagun, Historia General, 1938, Vol. 4, Book 12, Chapter VIII.

[4] Lienzo de Tlaxcala, Pl. 17.

[5] Sahagun, Historia General, 1938, Vol. 4, Book 12, Chapter XXIII. Duran, Historia, II, 1880, Chapter LXXVI, p. 50.

[6] Diaz del Castillo, True History, 1908–16, Vol. 2, Chapter CXXVIII, p. 247, says no!! Bancroft, Conquest, Vol. 1, p. 480, says yes!! on authority.

[7] Sahagun, Historia General, 1938, Vol. 4, Book 12, Chapter XXXIII.

CHAPTER XV

● 114 This chapter is the merest résumé of what the visitor to Mexico may see of the Indian past. Very properly one may insert here, as footnote 1, the twelve English books on Mexico, which, in the writer's judgment, are best suited to prepare the visitor for what he may see.

[1] Henry Bamford Parkes, History of Mexico, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1938. A history devoted chiefly to colonial and republican Mexico.

Herbert Joseph Spinden, Ancient Civilization of Mexico and Middle America, American Museum of Natural History, Handbook Series, No. 3, New York, 1928. A masterpiece of exposition, short and simple, incredibly packed with knowledge, a sine qua non for the understanding of Indian civilization.

Charles Flandrau, Viva Mexico, New York, 1908. An enchanting series of impressions of Mexico under Diaz.

Bernal Diaz del Castillo, The True History of the Conquest of New Spain, Hackluyt Society, Series 2, Vols. 23–25, 30, 40, London, 1908–16. This old warrior, a soldier under Cortes, gives the most personal account of the Conquest.

William Hickling Prescott, The Conquest of Mexico, Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1922. Not only a brilliant account of the Conquest as seen through Spanish eyes, but one of the masterpieces of American literature.

J. Eric Thompson, Mexico before Cortes, Scribners, New York, 1933. An intimately alive picture of the Aztec civilization.

George C. Vaillant, Artists and Craftsmen in Ancient Central America, American Museum of Natural History Guide Leaflet Series 88 and 103, 1935. A survey of Middle American art, fully illustrated, for a very low price.

Anita Brenner, Idols behind Altars, Payson and Clarke, Ltd., New York, 1929. A superb picture of the Mexican artistic renaissance of 1918 and the essential continuity of Indian life.

Ernest Gruening, Mexico and Its Heritage, the Century Co., New York, 1928. A carefully documented study of the conflicts inherent in modern Mexican economic and social life.

C. S. Braden, Religious Aspects of the Conquest of Mexico, Duke University Press, Durham, N.C., 1930. The theory of the evangelization of the Mexican Indian, showing the humanitarian theories behind the consolidation of the Spanish Conquest.

Madame Calderon de la Barca, Life in Mexico, E. P. Dutton and Co., New York, 1931. The Scottish wife of the Spanish ambassador to Mexico in 1828 writes a most entertaining account of contemporary habits and customs. A classic.

Stuart Chase, Mexico, A Study of Two Americas, Macmillan Co., New York, 1931. A succinct, slightly *simpliste* account of contemporary Mexico with special emphasis on the virtues of unmechanized life.

[2] Braden, Religious Aspects, 1930. Ricard, Conquête Spirituelle, 1933.

[3] The amount of writing by the different monastic orders is interesting as a reflection of direct interest in indian affairs: Franciscan, 68; Jesuit, 19; Dominican, 18; Augustinian, 3; parish priests, 18; civilians, 6; cf. Clavigero, History, 1787, and Ricard, Conquête Spirituelle: Spanish Friars, 61; Indians and Mestizos, 61; Spanish Civilians, 6; Foreign Friars, 7.

[4] Indian authors and approximate dates of composition: Tezozomoc, before 1561; Anales de Cuauhtitlan, 1570; Duran, 1581; Ixtlilxochitl, 1600; Chimalpahin, 1613.

Post-Conquest picture writings and closing dates: Codex Telleriano-Remensis and Vaticanus A, 1563; Codex of 1576, 1607; Codex of 1590, 1590; Histoire Mexicaine, 1521.

[5] ——, Arquitectura Colonial, 1933, p. 27. Granados y MacGregor, Huexotcingo, 1934.

[6] Nuttall, Official Reports, 1926. Del Paso y Troncoso, Papeles de Nueva España, 1905–06.

[7] Redfield, Tepoztlan, 1930. Parsons, Mitla, 1936.

[8] Brenner, Idols behind Altars, 1929. Chase, Mexico, 1931.

[9] The perfect guide for Mexico has yet to be written. Terry, Guide, 1927, the most full, approaching Baedeker. Brenner, Your Mexican Holiday, 1932, good for the traveler. Marett, Archaeological Tours, 1934, good for a person interested in archaeology, since many ruins are not on beaten path. ——, Tres Siglos de Arquitectura Colonial, 1933, brief illustrated guide. ——, Monumentos Prehispanicos, 1933, brief illustrated guide.

[10] The index will provide references to descriptions of the sites given in the text.

[p. 298 is blank]

Temporary Foreword

114 The *Florentine Codex* is one of three well-known manuscripts planned by Fray Bernardino de Sahagún to describe the civilization of the Aztecs. The others, both of which are fragmentary, are the *Biblioteca del Palacio* and *Academia de la Historia* MSS in Madrid; these may have been field notes which Sahagún used for the complete version, the *Florentine Codex*. In this, Fr. Bernardino wrote the same accounts in parallel columns, Spanish on the left and Aztec on the right. The work was profusely illustrated. The Spanish text sometimes was fuller than, and sometimes only summarized, the Aztec text. From this codex stemmed the Spanish texts published by Bustamante and, probably, Kingsborough, more than a century ago; and these early printed versions are the basis of later editions. Sahagún named his work *Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España;* the term *Florentine Codex* used in this Temporary Preface means Sahagún's *Historia* in the famed manuscript of the Laurentian Library, Florence, Italy.

A microfilm copy of the *Florentine Codex* was secured in 1938 by the late Lansing B. Bloom who, with his wife, was sent to various European Libraries to secure microfilms of this and other important manuscripts—mostly relating to Southwestern history. Mr. and Mrs. Bloom performed wonders in the face of considerable difficulties. The project was a joint undertaking of the School of American Research, the University of New Mexico, and the Bandelier Centennial Committee.

The microfilm negatives were delivered to the late Dr. E. L. Hewett, then Director of the School of American Research and the Museum of New Mexico, in 1939. As prime mover in the securing of the copy of the *Florentine Codex* for the School of American Research, he was interested in its being published; and as an anthropologist, he recognized the necessity of a complete English translation of the Aztec, of which only a little had been translated into any language.

First, photographic enlargements were made from the negatives, by Miss Bertha P. Dutton and Miss Hulda Hobbs of the School of American Research. One copy remained with the School of American Research, and another was deposited for additional security with the University of New Mexico. Later, Dr. Sylvanus G. Morley arranged for the distribution of four additional copies in American universities and other institutions which were interested, and with the Mexican Government. It was stipulated that these copies were not to be published for a period of five years.

In the eighteen months during which Dr. Morley was Director of the School of American Research and the Museum of New Mexico, he carried on the plans started by Dr. Hewett for the translation of the Aztec text of Sahagún's immortal *Historia*, a project which he also had for some years been interested in seeing through. The final outline of procedure was completed just before his last illness. He would undoubtedly have been deeply concerned with and infinitely helpful in its progress had he lived.

To carry out the considerable task of translating the twelve books of Sahagún's *magnum opus*, Dr. Morley brought together the only two scholars in the United States whom he knew, at the time, to be prepared to undertake the work. Dr. Charles E. Dibble's studies in the Mexican field had aroused his admiration. Dr. Arthur J. O. Anderson, on the instance of Dr. Morley and Dr. Hewett, had been studying Nahuatl for some years. By arrangement with Dr. A. R. Olpin, President of the University of Utah, Dr. Dibble's teaching schedule at the University was modified so that he could devote half of his time to the translation project. Dr. Morley similarly made adjustments with Dr. Anderson's time at the Museum of New Mexico.

The plan, as developed by Dr. Morley, Dr. Dibble, and Dr. Anderson, was to translate the dozen books of Sahagún's *Historia* singly and not necessarily in the order in which they appear in the *Florentine Codex* and the printed Spanish and French editions, and to publish them as completed, as Parts II-XIII of a Monograph of the School of American Research and a Publication of the University of Utah. Part I was to appear last of all, and to include a Preface and other introductory material, the Table of Contents, the Bibliography, and the General Index. Each part was to be fully illustrated, and, because of their unusual clarity, the Paso y Troncoso illustrations were to be reproduced.

These plans are being carried out.

As to translation procedure, Dr. Morley urged that the product be in readable English. The compilation of Fray Bernardino de Sahagún, so valuable to the anthropologist and the historian, was to be regarded as a major source book for the student, yet presented so as to be of value to the scholar and of interest to the general reader. Taking advantage of some broad similarities between English and Aztec syntax, the translators were to put it into English such that the structure of the translations would resemble as closely as possible that of the original. Since the Spanish text

[p. iv (A)]

114 of the *Florentine Codex* was Sahagún's sixteenth-century Spanish, the English translation of the Nahuatl was to parallel, in a sense, the late Renaissance feeling of Sahagún's Spanish through the employment of occasional archaisms which might give it something of the atmosphere of the King James version of the Bible. This procedure, while it precludes a translation which would be word-for-word a precise duplicate (in English), would, it was felt, still preserve sufficient accuracy in its presentation of the meaning of the Aztec version.

A less flexible rendition would, of course, have been possible; or an interlinear. A linguistic study, however, was not contemplated in this translation. For the linguist, and for any who would wish to check the accuracy of the translation, the Aztec of the *Florentine Codex* was to be faithfully reproduced.

This procedure the translators have attempted to follow.

If, when the total translation project is completed, the translators have produced a work sufficiently accurate to convey reliably the meaning of the Aztec, and thus be of use to the historian and ethnologist, they will have sufficiently accomplished their purpose.

000

A. Ray Olpin

A. Ray Olpin
President
University of Utah

Boaz Long

Boaz Long
Director
School of American Research

TRANSLATORS' NOTE

The translators wish to acknowledge the encouragement and coöperation of Hon. Boaz Long, Director of the School of American Research and the Museum of New Mexico, of Dr. A. R. Olpin, President of the University of Utah, of Albert G. Ely, Executive Secretary of the Museum of New Mexico; and of Dean O. Meredith Wilson, University College, Dr. Harold W. Bentley, Director of the University of Utah Press, and Dr. E. Adamson Hoebel, Head of the Department of Anthropology, all of the University of Utah. They also express their gratitude to their right-hand man, Miss Jo Maison, and to their wives for their unusual forbearance.

[p. iv (B)]

8: Barlow E-4 (no date)1949 NU7 Aztec NU7

I. INTRODUCTION

NATURE OF THE PRESENT STUDY

THE PRESENT PAPER is the first part of a study of the empire that 21 Cortés invaded when he set foot at Vera Cruz in 1519. This is [10] the empire wrongly called "Aztec"—a term which the writer has considered elsewhere[1] and for which he proposes to substitute the name "Culhua Mexica." This and a second paper, to be published later, deal with the geographical extent of the Empire of the Culhua Mexica and with its division into tributary provinces. All towns that can be proved to have been subject to the Valley of Mexico in 1519 will be dealt with in the two parts of this study of Culhua Mexica. Later and more detailed portions of the larger study consider this vast Empire chronologically: how and when it came to reach its final dimensions, who dominated it at the outset and who toward the end, and so forth. The present mapping of the Empire of the Culhua Mexica is a necessary preliminary to the historical studies (in the form of local histories) which are to follow, and which are the writer's chief aim.

Great exactness is possible in mapping the Empire (see map at end 114 of book), because of one monumental document, the *Matricula de* 128 *Tributos;* its bibliography is considered in the second section of this Introduction. It is the original native tribute list, in which the payment exacted from the provinces was recorded; it is the official bookkeeping ledger of the Empire, a hardheaded, realistic document. The *Matricula* 211 is shaped like a book, in which hieroglyphs for various towns— 65] ranging in number from two to nearly thirty—of a province are

---

[1] R. H. Barlow, "Some Remarks on the term 'Aztec Empire,'" *The Americas* (1945), :344-349.

This empire was the product of a Triple Alliance among three tribes settled in the [648] Valley of Mexico. These three tribes differed in religion, in customs, and doubtless in many other things. Their names were the Tepaneca, the Acolhuaque, and the Mexica. (The Mexica were subdivided into Tenochca and Tlatelolca.) The chief towns of each uring the period of the Empire—roughly speaking, the century before the Spaniards ame—were Tlacopan [Tacuba], Texcoco, and Mexico-Tenochtitlan (with Mexico-Tlatelolco active from 1428 to 1473). In 1519, the end of the native period, the Mexica of Tenochtitlan had quite overshadowed their allies, so that it is proper to call the Empire f the final period—which is the period of the present study—the Empire of the Mexica r Mexicans. But more exactly, it should be called the Empire of the Culhua Mexica, for easons I have set forth in the above-cited paper. It is hopelessly erroneous to call it the Aztec Empire, for although the name Aztec was once applied to the Culhua Mexica, at the art of their history, they had discarded it long before founding their capital city.

114 painted along the outer and lower margins of the page, the rest of the
128 page being taken up by the items of tribute for which these towns
211 were jointly responsible. The place names on a given page prove to
65 be geographically contiguous on modern maps, and so it is evident that the towns were regarded as a unit, as all having something in common. I have called each region thus indicated a "province," partly in order to provide some territorial division, but also because these groupings of towns were in some measure expressions of former political or linguistic units. Most of the Matlatzinca-speaking towns, for example, cluster on a page of their own; moreover, they were all conquered in a continuous campaign of a few years. These provinces (indicated on the map by large arabic numerals) I have named after the introductory glyphs, assuming the first glyph on each page to represent the most important town. Other available sources justify this. In another source, for instance, in the province I have named Tepequacuilco, Tepequacuilco is stated to be the "presidio de gente de guarnicion que cobravan los tributos: y recogieron de toda la cuisca [Cohuixca]";[2] in that which I have named Coayxtlahuacan, Coayxtlahuacan is called "donde el dicho Munteçuma tenia puesta su frontera de gente de guerra."[3] The borders of the provinces as they existed in 1519 have been commented on in detail where these were adjacent to non-Mexican lands.

Most of these invaluable place glyphs of the *Matricula* could be read even if they were all we had, and they are of course the final authorities. The task of reading them, however, is greatly simplified by the annotations they bear; the *Matricula* itself contains scattered and not always reliable identifications in roman letters, and the copy of the *Matricula* in the *Codex Mendocino* contains a complete series of highly reliable ones. In order to have some norm for spelling, I have everywhere followed these *Mendocino* versions. There are objections to this procedure—which gives us "Tuluca" for what is better rendered "Tolocan,"—but it shows how one Indian pronounced all the names of the Empire before the corrupting European influences set in.

---

[2] *Relación de Iguala* (1931), p. 223.

[3] *PNE*, 4: 165; 4: 198 agrees. Likewise, Tochpan (Tuchpa in *Mendocino*) has seven towns, and Ixtlilxochitl (*Obras historicas* [1892], II: 197) says that "La gran provincia de Tochpan se dividia en siete provincias." The fact that the initial glyph is often the only one identified in roman letters in the *Matricula* is also taken into account.

I have included a certain amount of related ethnographic material 128 which has appeared in the course of accumulating data on place names and locations. Names for certain stretches of territory, names of language groups (these two often intertwined), reasons for such names, and occasional remarks on customs or gods form the main part of this supplementary material, which shows the great diversity of the Empire. (This diversity is still present: even today, a traveler in Mexico can see twenty countries in one.)

Here, however, the supplement stops. I have reluctantly excluded every scrap of the historical sections originally written to accompany these provinces. By suppressing an approximate history now, I can give an accurate history later. Nor has it been possible here to touch on the question of government and administration of tribute,[4] and on the topics of the motivations and formulae of native warfare, all of which need reëxamination.

In view of the nature of the authority for this map of the Empire 114 of the Culhua Mexica—a tribute reckoning—it has, however, seemed 128 appropriate to add some data on tribute. These data come chiefly from two sources: the *Matricula*, which gives the tribute from provinces as units, but not from their component towns; and the geographical *relaciones* of the 1580's, which often record the kind of tribute from a given town. Here again, I have omitted incidental materials in order to focus on the map. I have treated the *Matricula* tribute data in a summary fashion,[5] but have given all other tribute information in full.

---

[4] Manuel Moreno, *La organización política y social de los aztecas* (1931), gives something on these points.

[5] I.e., by simply presenting whatever the Spanish annotations of the *Mendocino* copy say (for these give the frequency of payment, which is not deducible from the *Matricula* pictures alone), and by correcting a few errors in regard to quantities of goods. This method leaves much to be desired. A real study of the *Matricula* tributes would involve that document and its two copies—the checking of all items in all variant drawings and annotations from different hands, with special note taken of the quite unexploited annotations in Náhuatl on the *Matricula*; the investigation of native measurements and weights; the detailed itemization of various styles of mantles, skirts, and warriors' costumes portrayed (each of which has a name and a symbolism and many of which are badges of certain social categories); the question how often payment was made and into whose hands, where it was stored, and many other matters. Until such a study is prepared, the student should consult Cooper Clark's edition of the *Mendocino*, supplementing this with the works of Eduard Seler, especially his *Altmexikanischer Schmuck und soziale und militärische Rangabzeichen*. On the frequency of tribute payment, some observations have been made by R. C. E. Long, *The Payment of Tribute in the Codex Mendoza* (1942), and by R. H. Barlow, *The Periods of Tribute Collection in Moctezuma's Empire* (1943). Those interested in place glyphs and etymologies should see Peñafiel's imperfect, but still not superseded, *Nombres geográficos de México* (1885).

The Matricula de Tributos

114 En estos Fragmentos se ve el más auténtico testimonio de la opulencia, grandeza, y Majestad de este Imperio Mexicano.

—Archbishop Lorenzana

The map the publication of which is begun in this work is based primarily on one document. Since the relationship of this document to its copies and editions has not been worked out before, it is proper to turn our attention to bibliography.

The *Matricula de Tributos*[6] is a folio manuscript, painted on coarse native paper, arranged like a European book. It is preserved in the Salon de Codices of the Museo Nacional de Arqueología de México and bears the exhibit number 52. Originally it must have contained more than eighteen folios, although today it has dwindled sadly.[7] On both sides of each of these folios are painted the hieroglyphs of the towns which were subject to the Triple Alliance of Mexico, Texcoco, and Tlacopan, as well as those of the tributes they paid.[8] The *Matricula* was probably made after 1511 or 1512, as I have remarked elsewhere.[9] Its European format hints that it may have been painted for Cortés, who soon had it in his hands and was learning the likeliest fields for pillage. Bernal Díaz tells us: "En los libros de la rrenta de montezuma miravamos de donde le trayan los tributos del oro y donde avia minas y cacao y rropa de mantas y de aquellas partes que viamos en los libros y las quentas que en ellos tenian montezuma que se lo trayan queriamos."[10] Afterward it doubtless served as a touchstone for taxability. When the first generation of unhappy mestizos was about come of age, the Viceroy Mendoza had the *Matricula* copied as part of the compilation made to show His Sacred and Caesarian Majesty what

---

[6] Named by Boturini in his *Catalogo del Museo Historico Indiano* (1743).

[7] Peñafiel, *Monumentos del arte mexicano antiguo* (1890), p. 69, interprets the number 35, written on the last sheet of the manuscript as it exists today, to mean that it had 35 pages originally. This, however, is merely the number given in the Boturini inventory.

[8] That the *Matricula* contained records of the tributes of both Mexico and Texcoco is clear from the inclusion of the provinces of Quauhnahuac and Tlalcoçauhtitlan, with certain subordinate towns which were specifically subject to Texcoco, as Ixtlilxochitl (*Obras históricas*, T. II: *Historia Chichimeca* [1892], p. 89) and other sources inform us. It also includes the province of Xilotepec, which with its towns was subject to Tlacopan specifically ("La orden que tenian los indios ... ," *ENE*, 14: 145–148).

[9] Anderson and Barlow, "The Maize Tribute of Moctezuma's Empire," *Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden* (1943), 30: 414–415.

[10] *Historia verdadera de la conquista de la Nueva España* (1904), II: 144.

New Spain was like. This copy (which is not generally realized to be a copy)[illegible] preserves for us the manuscript as it stood in the 1540's. It is possible that a leaf or two had been lost before that date. Since four leaves have been lost since then, this copy is very precious. This *Mendocino* copy shows that the *Matricula* had thirty-six pages and somewhat more (a matter which cannot be commented on here), that is, eighteen leaves *plus*, at that time. The military history section of the *Mendocino* was also copied from the *Matricula*, where only a scrap of it survives. Probably the ethnographic section of the *Mendocino* was the only one painted especially for it. The manner in which two leaves of the *Matricula* were lost completely and two were carried off is noted below.

Sometime in the sixteenth century the manuscript was annotated unsystematically in Náhuatl. This must have been after the *Mendocino* copy was made, for the latter does not take cognizance of these annotations, but provides others.[illegible]

The *Matricula* disappears in that neglected century of consolidation, the seventeenth. In the first half of the eighteenth, however, it came into the hands of Lorenzo Boturini, the Italian Guadalupe enthusiast, whose immeasurably rich collection embraced almost every document on which our knowledge of ancient Mexican history is based. In the

---

[illegible] Orozco y Berra suspected that it was. The preface to the 1925 del Paso edition says (*Códice Mendocino*, p. vii): "No se sabe si es obra original de los indios instruidos comisionados especialmente por Mendoza, o copia de distintas pinturas antiguas colegidas en el códice." And even that astute bibliographer Gómez de Orozco is skittish: "pudo ser la fuente [del Códice Mendocino] el codice llamado Matricula de los Tributos ... u otro muy semejante, pues que existen algunas variantes entre este y el codice Mendocino" ("¿Quien fué el autor material del códice Mendocino?" *Revista mexicana de estudios antropológicos* [1941], 5: 44). In the absence of the much-needed variorum edition of the *Matricula*, but with the related manuscript and editions described here—and lacking space for more extended discussion,—one can only dogmatize. The tribute section of the *Mendocino* is unquestionably a copy of the *Matricula*. The only differences between the pictures of the two are minute. Sometimes two pages in the *Mendocino* are devoted to material which occupies only one page in the *Matricula*, and in the province of Çihuatlan the town of Xolochiuyan has been placed out of sequence by the *Mendocino* artist. A few erasures have occurred in the *Matricula*, leaving gaps and traces of the erased material. Such variants as these are not worth itemizing further.

[illegible] The names of the warriors' costumes, for example, are given in the *Matricula* annotations, but are lacking in the *Mendocino*. The *Matricula* gives "Tlacotepec" in Toluca Province, whereas the *Mendocino* gives a probably erroneous "Mitepec." The *Matricula* gives "Panchimalco" in Quauhnahuac; the *Mendocino*, the certainly erroneous "Chimalco." As a whole, however, the town names of the *Mendocino* are highly accurate; these minor slips are cited to show that the *Mendocino* annotator saw a still unannotated *Matricula*.

inventory made of his papers, July 15, 1745, it appears as No. 35 of "Ymbentario 2°."[33] It also figures in the printed catalogue of the following year, § VII, No. 9, where it received the name of "*Matricula.*"[34]

A very inexpert copy of the *Matricula*, now bound with it, was made about this time. It appears in the "Ymbentario 2°" as No. 36,[35] in the printed catalogue. This copy does not fully reproduce the initial page, which had become nearly effaced. Four pages of this wretched copy were published by Peñafiel, that is, those corresponding with the two leaves carried off to Philadelphia—an event noted below.[36] The *Matricula* suffered the fate of all Boturini's collection, being taken as part of the evidence of his crime of collecting funds to make a crown for the Virgin of Guadalupe. It lay in one of the secretarías of the Gobierno del Virreinato until 1770, when Archbishop Lorenzana published the first of the editions it has suffered.[37] By Boturini's day (mid-eighteenth century) the manuscript had been reduced from the eighteen leaves plus of *circa* 1540, to sixteen leaves in the Lorenzana publication. The losses were the leaf containing the provinces of Tlachquiauco (recto) and Tochtepec (verso) and that containing Axocopan (recto) and Atotonilco (verso).[38] Lorenzana's edition is imaginatively unfaithful, being a series of lopsided copper-plate engravings. One page is so wretchedly copied that the "artist" has a vacant space left, which he plugged up with a cherub blowing a trumpet—a very curious item to find in Moctezuma's tribute list. This edition includes the Náhuatl annotations, as well as the Spanish translations which certain of them had acquired in the meantime.

---

[33] "Este, es otra Matricula, como la antecedente en el mismo Papel de Pasta, todo figurado con caracteres, en [*sic*] antiquissimo, no tiene por donde se perziua a que Provincia toque. en diez y seis Fs" ("Inventario de los documentos recogidos á D. Lorenzo Boturini, 15 July 1745," *Anales del Museo Nacional ... de México* [1925], Epoca IV, T. 3).

[34] "Original. Una Matricula de Tributos, que se pagaban a los dos Reynos de Mexico, y Tlatilúlco por las respectivas provincias subditas. Es de 16. fojas de papel Indiano, aunque le falta algo del principio, y fin, y se pintan en ella los lugares tributarios, y las especies de los tributos, que pagaban en frutos, y otros generos" (*ibid.*).

[35] "Esta es copia del antecedente, se halla en Papel de Marca mayor en diez y seis fojas" (*ibid.*).

[36] Peñafiel, *Monumentos del arte mexicano antiguo* (1890), pls. 256–259.

[37] "Fragmentos de un Mapa de Tributos, ó Cordillera de los Pueblos ... " in Lorenzana's edition of Cortés, *Historia de Nueva España* (1770), pls. following p. 176.

[38] Not Atotonilco el Grande (see p. 64), which is on p. 8 of the manuscript as it exists today.

Sixty years after the appearance of Lorenzana's edition, the original *Matricula* suffered further loss. Two folios were detached by Poinsett, the American minister of Iturbide's day, who carried them off to Philadelphia, along with a large collection of Mexican antiquities on which there is no report available. One of these folios, half torn away since Lorenzana's edition, contains the provinces of Tlatelolco (recto) and Petlacalco (verso). The other contains Tlatlauhquitepec (recto) and Tuchpa (verso).[illegible] With this final mutilation, the document was left in its present state, except for a binding which it acquired sometime in the nineteenth century. It has been in the Museo Nacional for many decades, where Sr. Fernando Gamboa has recently devised a setting worthy of it, amid a welter of gold nose-plugs, green feathers, cacao, paper, and the like.

In view of all these mutilations, I wish to state that I cite the present pagination throughout.

At the end of this same nineteenth century, in which the *Matricula* was at first seriously maltreated, the nobility of the old document was appreciated, and a lithographed edition in heightened colors was published by Peñafiel. This edition partakes of the usual defects of "official" scholarship of the Batres Era and omits[illegible] the annotations in European writing. As recompense, the editor had the prices which he thought the tribute would bring on the open market added up, and published this in many solemn tables.

With the recent recovery of the Philadelphia pages, the story of the *Matricula* is complete. As there has never been a usable edition of it, I have had to work with diminutive photographs of the original. A good edition and a serious commentary on this document are much needed.

[illegible] They were published in the *Transactions* of the American Philosophical Society (n.s. [1893], Vol. 17, following p. [62]), in whose possession they and the other antiquities were left. Recently they have been recovered but not restored to their place in the manuscript.

[illegible] As in the unpardonable cases of the Codices Colombino and Sánchez Solís.

II. THE TARASCAN FRONTIER

128 Because there were many provinces in the Empire which it is our purpose to delimit, some few grand divisions seem advisable. These have been made in a rather arbitrary way, with varying criteria. In certain regions it is possible to point out a particular zone as the special sphere of influence of some one or another member of the Triple Alliance. The six provinces described below, however, have been grouped on the basis of their common enemy and peril, the Purépecha or Tarascans, against whom they formed a long frontier. Brand has published a useful map of the Tarascan dominions and their fortified towns facing the Mexica, from the Río de las Balsas north.[1]

1. ÇIHUATLAN

SOURCES OF THE MAP

635 On the sixteenth page of the *Matricula* and on folio 38ʳ of the *Codex*
114 *Mendocino* appear the twelve towns of the most westerly province of the Empire we are about to depict. This province, now the "Costa Grande" of Guerrero, extends west of Acapulco to the outlet of the Río de las Balsas. In the *Matricula,* seven of the towns are identified by annotations in roman letters; in the *Mendocino,* all are. The province of Çihuatlan was in a region which is wretchedly mapped to this day, where half the place names seem to have disappeared. If it were not for a "Relación de los pueblos que visitó Gaspar Xuarez en la provincia de Çacatula," of the mid-sixteenth century, the present map would scarcely be possible. There is supplementary information in the relación of Zacatula itself, dating from the 1580's, which the writer has published from a nineteenth-century copy—the original remaining unpublished and apparently unpublishable, for some mysterious reason known only to its present guardians.

635 Since this relación was available only after the printing of the map,
114 two or three inconsistencies between map and text have inevitably
128 resulted.

The "Millionth Map" of the American Geographical Society, sheet

---

[1] Brand, "An Historical Sketch of Geography and Anthropology in the Tarascan Region. Part I," *New Mexico Anthropologist* (1943), Vol. 6–7, facing p. 60.

"Ciudad de México," has been used as the skeleton of the present map; 635
the filling-in has come largely from Xuarez' report. Towns which 114
have been identified are given below, the left-hand column containing 128
their names as written in the *Codex Mendocino* and the right-hand
column containing the equivalents when present on the modern map.
The number following each name indicates the location of the town
on the accompanying map (at the back of this book). A question mark
in parentheses means that the location of the town is uncertain.

[103]

MENDOCINO	MILLIONTH MAP
Apancalecã (?), 2	[Missing]
Coyucac, 8	Coyoquilla
Nochcoc, 10	Nuxco
Panotlan, 9	[Missing]
Petlatlan, 6	Petatlán
Xihuacan, 5	[Missing]
Xolochiuhyan, 7	Jolochuca
Yztapan, 3	[Missing]
Çacatulan, 1	[Missing]
Çihuatlan, 9 [*sic*]	[See Remarks on Towns]

Aside from doubtfully identified Apancalecan, two pueblos of the *Mendocino* list remain entirely unidentified. These are Colima and Coçohuipilecan. This Colima can hardly be the Colima of the modern state of the same name, because of the distances involved. Coçohuipilecan, however, appears as "Coçohuipillan" in the conquest list of Ahuizotl, among other names of this province.

For reasons explained below, to these towns from the *Matricula* and its *Mendocino* copy may be added the pueblos of Acapulco (13), Anecuilco (12), and Citlaltomaua (11).

REMARKS ON TOWNS

Acapulco, like Coçohuipilecan, is one of the towns conquered by 632
Ahuizotl. Its absence from the tribute list is due to its slight impor- [505]
tance in aboriginal days—to nonseafarers the celebrated port facilities 131
meant nothing at all. It is even possible that the tribute list may refer
to an Acapulco near Zacatula, mentioned in the relación of that town,
in which case Yopitzinco may have extended farther west along the
coast.

8: Barlow E-4 (no date)1949 NU7 Aztec NU7

632 114 131 *Anecuilco* (near Çeuctla) is added on the authority of the sixteenth-century relación of this and of the following town. (These two are included in the province of Çihuatlan somewhat arbitrarily, in the interest of symmetrical disposition.) Anecuilco and its companion Citlaltomaua "tributaban al rrey que era de Mexico que se llamava Monteçuma."[2] It lay behind the high mountains east of Citlaltomaua [491] (whose location is considered below), eight leagues of "muy mal [133] camino ... de muchas bueltas" distant.[3] The river upon which it was situated sprang from the sierra of Tlacatepetl, taking the name of Xiquipila in its lower reaches from another pueblo on its banks, and emptying in the southeast into the "playa y boca que dizen de Nagualan." A tributary of this river was called the Nexatl.[4] All of these names save that of the sierra Tlacatepetl have disappeared. However, since Citlaltomaua lay on the Río Coyuca (as appears below), this other river springing from the Tlacatepetl must be the present Río Papagallo. The Río Sabana, which is the only other possibility, has a source nearer the coast than the sierra mentioned. The rest of Anecuilco's location depends on that of Citlaltomaua.

Apancalecan may be either the Atenchancaleca of Gaspar Xuarez,[5] two leagues from "the Villa" (Zacatula), or Echancaleca (No. 863 of the same document), one league from the Villa. (All three names [103] mean "Place of the Owners of Houses by the Sea.") In any case, like [101] Zacatula, it appears too far east on the accompanying map.

Citlaltomaua was eight leagues from the sea, seven from Coyuca [491] de Benítez (d) and seventeen "leguas de muy malos caminos de Acapulco, azia el sueste." It lay to the south of the high and broken mountains of the Tlacatepetl. Two leagues below it a river was formed which emptied "en la mar del sur en la playa que dizen de Coyuca." An estancia of Citlaltomaua, the only one of these names (except for the sierra of Tlacatepetl) which can be found today, lay about "una legua hazia el nascimiento del sol." This was called Tepetiztla (c)[6] and appears as "Tepetixtla" on some maps today, others giving it as "Tepetlixpa."

---

[2] *PNE*, 6: 158.
[3] *PNE*, 6: 165.
[4] *PNE*, 6: 160.
[5] *PNE*, 1: No. 854.
[6] *PNE*, 6: 155–159.

Tribute of the component towns.—In view of the poor documentation on this whole province, all that can be gleaned concerning the tribute of the component towns is that Anecuilco and Citlaltomaua gave slaves, who were, of course, captives taken in border skirmishes (as noted in the tribute list for Zompanco in the province of Tepequacuilco), mantles, and gold dust.[28] 651

2. TEPEQUACUILCO

SOURCES OF THE MAP

On the fifteenth page of the *Matricula*, copied as folio 37' of the *Codex Mendocino,* are listed the tributary towns of a province situated in what is now north-central Guerrero. They are headed by Tepequacuilco, which is the only town identified in roman letters in the original document, although the *Mendocino* copy identifies all. There are fourteen towns listed in the copy; the original, however, lacks the glyphs for Teloloapan and Chilacachapan, which have been mysteriously erased. The American Geographical Society's "Millionth Map," sheet "Ciudad de México," has served for the reconstruction of this province. Original and present place names appear below: 635 114

103

MENDOCINO	MILLIONTH MAP
Alahuiztlã, 21	Alahuistlán
Atenanco, 8	Atengo del Río
Cocolan, 13	Cocula
Cueçalan, 7	Cuetzala
Chilacachapã, 12	Chilicachapa
Chilapan, 4	Chilapa
Huitzoco, 16	Huitzuco
Ohuapã, 6	Oapan
Oztoma, 19	[Missing]
Teloloapan, 11	[No change]
Tepequacuilco, 15	Tepecoacuilco
Tlachmalacac, 18	Tlaxmalac
Ychcateopã, 20	Ixcateopan
Yoallan, 17	Iguala

All these towns have been located. To them we may add a series of border towns of lesser tributary importance, and therefore omitted 635

---

[28] "Al rrey que era de Mexica ... le dauan esclavos e mantas e oro en polvo que sacauan y lavaban de los rrios a ellos cercanos." It is said, absurdly enough, that "los esclavos que ellos dauan al dicho Monteçuma eran para que los dichos Mexicanos comyesen" (*PNE*, 6: 158).

8: Barlow E-4 (no date)1949 NU7 Aztec NU7

197 Chilapan is given in Sahagún as Cohuixca, and elsewhere as "lengua mexicana ... no tan pulida," and since the latter source uses the same words for the speech of Zompanco, Zompanco may be classified with the Cohuixca towns.

[114] Ample texts from the Cohuixca are preserved in the seventeenth-century "Tratado de las Supersticiones ... " of Ruíz de Alarcón.

So much for the linguistic situation in the east. The northwesterly towns of the province of Tepequacuilco were mostly Chontal-speaking: the Chontal were the aborigines there, against whom war was still being waged in 1519. These Chontal towns were Alahuiztlan, Ychcateopan, Oztoma, Totoltetec, and—in earlier times, at least—Cueçalan. Further material on these Chontales de Guerrero is given in the section on Tlachco.

Between the Cohuixca and Chontal regions, south of Iguala, tongues called Matlame and Tuxteco were spoken, according to an unpublished map by Paul Kirchoff.

It was in the southwest part of the province that this linguistic complexity reached its peak. Tetela was Cuitlatec in speech. South of Tetela the utterly mysterious and vanished [?] Tepuzteco was spoken in Otlatlan and Tlacotepec.

635 *Provincial borders in 1519.*—The frontier to the west may be rather
131 precisely delimited, since we have evidence from a long chain of fron-
632 tier towns. Let us examine them from north to south.

Alahuiztlan, in the north, used to send help down to the famous garrison town of Oztoma: food and arms and troops. Alahuiztlan

---

PNE, 5: 176.

PNE, 6: 315.

Cf. "lengua casi mexicana," n. 46 above.

PNE, 6: 143: "Son los antiguos de la tierra."

PNE, 6: 100.

PNE, 6: 89.

PNE, 6: 106.

PNE, 6: 149.

PNE, 6: 138.

Cited by Weitlaner, "Chilacachapa y Tetelcingo," *El México Antiguo* (1941), 5: 256. Weitlaner's text also speaks of Texome in this area.

PNE, 6: 132. On Cuitlatec, see section on Çihuatlan.

PNE, 6: 128 (and p. 123, which remarks that the people of Tlacotepec called themselves "Tepegua"). On Tepuzteco, see section on Çihuatlan.

"Despues que fueron suxetos a Moteçuma y reyes de Mexico tenian la dicha gerra con los de Mechoacan; por mandado de los dichos rreyes de Mexico acudian con bastimentos y armas y ayuda, quando era menester, al fuerte que Moetzuma tenya en Oztuma" (*PNE*, 6: 102).

one from each household. These mantles were paid locally on each of 651
the eighteen fiestas of the year. Maize for tribute was grown on special 632
lands.[illegible]

4. OCUILAN

SOURCES OF THE MAP

On page 12 of the *Matricula* and on folio 34ʳ of the *Codex Mendocino* 635
appears the province of Ocuilan, which now forms part of the southern 114
portion of the State of Mexico. Only the *cabecera* is identified in the
former document; the latter bears all names added in roman letters.
The map which has been followed in restoring the province is the [128]
1:200,000 map of the "Estado de México," Secretaría de Agricultura y
Fomento (1927). Original and present place names are listed below:

MENDOCINO	1927 MAP
Coatepec, 3	Coatepec Harinas
Ocuilan, 7	[No change]
Temantzinco, 6	Tenancingo
Tequaloyan, 5	Tecualoya (Villa Guerrero)
Tonatiuhco, 4	Tonatico

One town remains to be located: Çincozcac.

To this list the two westerly towns of Zoltepec (2) and Temazcaltepec (1) have been added, on the authority of their sixteenth-century relaciones.[illegible]

REMARKS ON TOWNS

Çincozcac is cited by Tezozomoc (*Crónica mexicana* [1878], p. 528) 632
as Zicozcatlan, a town figuring in Ahuizotl's Guerrero campaigns. 175

The proper form *Zoltepec*, from *zollin*, "quail," has been restored 103
with the authority of these relaciones.[illegible]

NATURE OF THE PROVINCE

Inhabitants and languages.—Sahagún[illegible] tells us that "those who are 197
called Ocuiltecos live in the region of Toluca, on their lands and 101
boundaries. They have the same ways and customs of those of Toluca,

---

[illegible] *PNE*, 6: 276: "Tributaban al rey de México y generalmente daban mantas de tres braças de largo y una bara de ancho, de algodon, y entre dos tributarios casados un guipil y unas enaguas .... Hazian una sementera grande entre todo el pueblo e lo que della cojian lo juntauan estos governadores y la dauan cada año a Monteçuma, y las mantas dauan de veynte a veynte dias."

[illegible] "Relación de Sultepec": "heran subjetos a los rreyes de México a los quales tributavan." "Relación de Temazcaltepec": "eran en tiempo de su gentilidad subjetos a un señor de Mexico." *PNE*, 7: 11 and 20.

[illegible] *PNE*, 7: 101-"por los muchos codornices que ay se nombraron asi.

[illegible] *Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España* (1938), III: 128.

5. TULUCA

SOURCES OF THE MAP

Page 11 of the *Matricula* and folio 33' of the *Codex Mendocino* contain 635 the province of Tuluca, which is now part of the State of Mexico north 114 and east of the Nevado de Toluca (Zinantecatl). In the *Matricula* these towns are identified in roman letters, one of the names disagreeing with the version given in the *Mendocino* annotations, which are also present for every town glyph. This divergence is noted below. The present map is based on the 1:200,000 map of the "Estado de México," Secretaría de Agricultura y Fomento (1927). Below are the *Mendocino* names and modern names, in so far as the latter appear on the 1927 map: 103

MENDOCINO	1927 MAP
Cacalomaca, 6	Cacalomacán
Calimayan, 8	[No change]
Calixtlahuacã, 2	Calixtlahuaca
Metepec, 5	[No change]
Mitepec, 7	Tlacotepec
Teotenanco, 10	Tenango (del Valle)
Tepemaxalco, 9	[Missing]
Tuluca, 3	Toluca
Xicaltepec, 1	[Missing]
Çoquitzinco, 11	Xoquicingo

Two towns remain to be identified: Capulteopan and Tepetlhuiacan. 103

Tzinacantepec (4) has been added to these. It was conquered with 175 the rest of the province, according to the conquest lists of Axayacatl. 167 Another source adds that most of the inhabitants of Tzinacantepec fled to Michoacan, to a place called Tlaulan, the remaining folk making a special milpa in the service of their new master.[illegible]

---

trachas y ocote, ques tea para alumbrarse, y tinta hecha del zuma del ocote que se llama en su lengua ocotlili."

[illegible] "Los de Zinacantepec ... se fueron á Mechuacán, adonde ahora llaman Tlaulan, y así quedaron en la obediencia del Señor de México, y tomó para sí todas las tierras, y las arrendaba, y repartió algunas, y por ellas le pagaban tributo. Demás de ésto todos los matalcincos que quedaron hacían una sementera para el Señor de México, que tenía ochocientas brazas en largo y cuatrocientas en ancho" (Zurita, "Breve y sumaria relación de los señores," in García Icazbalceta, ed., *Nueva Colección* ... [1858–1866], III: 221). The exiles in Tlaulan felt the yoke of their persecutors again, for the year following the accession of Tizoc, the Mexicans "hicieron la fiesta en el templo de Huitzilopochtli con la sangre de los Matalcingos y los de Tlaula" ("Historia de los mexicanos por sus pinturas," in García Icazbalceta, ed., *ibid.*, p. 253).

8: Barlow E-4 (no date)1949 NU7 Aztec NU7

103 Valle de Bravo (12) and Villa Victoria (13) have likewise been added.

REMARKS ON TOWNS

632 [114] *Mitepec* is given in the usually reliable *Mendocino* interpretation, but no trace of such a town has been found. On the other hand, "Tlacotepec" (the *Matricula* version) is well known, and appears in the conquest lists of Axayacatl, who took all of this region. Tlacotepec, therefore, has been placed on the map.

Teotenanco retained its name as late as 1582, as we see in the relación of that year. Most of these *teo-* prefixes have been dropped, or supplanted by *huey-*, as remarked above.

Tepemaxalco appears in 1582 as a town a league north of Teotenanco. In the 1921 census it figures as a pueblo of the Municipio de San Antonio la Isla. However, only the latter (as La Isla) is on the 1927 map.

Valle de Bravo has been added from Brand's Tarascan map.

Villa Victoria is likewise added from Brand.

NATURE OF THE PROVINCE

101 197 [782 103] *Inhabitants and languages.*—The name of the province (Matlatzinca) and its people (who did not speak Mexican, but an Otomían language) seems to have come from *matlatl*, "net." Sahagún tries out various etymologies and finally decides that "they are called net [people] . . . because when they sacrificed anyone to their idol they threw him into a net, and there twisted and squeezed him in the said net until his intestines came out." The Matlatzinca are sometimes included among the Eight Tribes whom the Culhua Mexica met at the start of their migration. Matlatzinca-speakers were scattered far into Michoacan, where the village of Charo, northeast of Morelia, was still called San Miguel de Charo Matlatzinco in the eighteenth century. Westerly contacts and migrations were continued in the latter part of the fifteenth century, as has been mentioned above. The most southerly point in which the Matlatzinca have been noted by the writer is Cocolan, in the province of Tepequacuilco, where their tongue was spoken jointly with Cohuixco in the 1580's.

PNE, 7: 1–7.

See p. 23 above.

PNE, 7: 4.

Op. cit., III: 127.

Relación de Iguala (1931), p. 222.

Provincial borders in 1519.—The province of Tuluca was a frontier 635
against Michoacan all along its western side. It was during their expan- 131
sion into this region that the Mexica met one of their few outstanding defeats, being thrown back after penetrating to the shores of Lake Cuitzeo. To the north lay the province of Xocotitlan (a single town and its tributaries); to the east, that of Quahuacan, long Mexicanized; and to the south, Ocuilan, which was separated from Tuluca by the mountain of the icy and sacred lake, the Zinantecatl, now called Nevado de Toluca.

Regional names.—The province of Tuluca was called the Matlat- 635
zinca[n] as far west as Temazcaltepec.[illegible] Since this term is a rather familiar one, the exact boundaries which it includes have not been investigated here.

TRIBUTE 651

Tribute of the whole province.—The province of Tuluca gave the following tribute, according to the *Matricula* and its *Mendocino* copy:

CLOTHING [291]

400 bundles of little white cotton mantles with decorated border**
400 bundles of henequen mantles, with designs in red, black, and white**
1,200 bundles of white henequen mantles** [714]
22 warriors' costumes and shields, 2 of them of fine quality*

FOOD

6 wooden cribs, 2 of maize, 2 of chian, 1 of beans, 1 of huauhtli* [262]

Tribute of the component towns.—Tzinacantepec's special milpa [632]
has been noted. No other information is available on this point.

6. MALINALCO

SOURCES OF THE MAP

Two provinces are shown on the thirteenth page of the *Matricula,* 635
which is copied as folio 35^r of the *Codex Mendocino*. The two sections 114
are separated by a strong line in the original, but in the copy this is so weak as to be scarcely visible, and it apparently was not visible to the annotator. There is no question, however, that we are dealing with

---

[illegible] *PNE* 7:16.

635 two distinct regions, for, as the map shows, they are separated by
114 various other provinces. One other page includes more than a single province, but there the provinces represent contiguous territories.[100] Here we are concerned with half the page: the province of Malinalco, which is shown on the left-hand side of the original and at the top of the copy. This province, containing two towns, is now a tiny segment of the State of Mexico, southeast of the Nevado de Toluca. The *Matricula* bears both names, written above the glyphs in roman letters, and disagrees with the *Mendocino* in regard to one form. The present
[126] map is based on that of the "Estado de México" in the atlas of the Secretaría de Agricultura y Fomento; the names of the towns as given in the atlas appear below, compared with those of the *Mendocino:*

[103]

MENDOCINO	ATLAS
Malinalco, 1	[No change]
Çonpahuacã, 2	Zumpahuacan

No towns have been added from other sources, although the subject towns of Malinalco in the sixteenth century are known and probably represent the old jurisdiction.[101]

REMARKS ON TOWNS

632
114 *Çonpahuacan* is given as "Tzonpanco" in the *Matricula* annotation. The glyph may be read either way; the name of the modern town, however, confirms the *Mendocino* version.

NATURE OF THE PROVINCE

34-6
635 *Inhabitants and languages.*—Malinalco was a great religious center. It is only recently that the temple there has been excavated. This is a complex structure cut from the living rock, unique in the New World, and in the Old World rivaled by only a few such structures in India. A shrine, entered through a semicircular arch—the open mouth of a stone serpent—is one of the spectacular features of these ruins, which may have been dedicated to the native Military Orders of the Eagle and Tiger Knights. The culture represented in the ruins of Malinalco

---

[100] I.e., the huge provinces of eastern Guerrero given on p. 18 of the *Matricula* and on fol. 40ʳ of the *Mendocino.*

[101] *PNE,* 1: No. 346.

8: Barlow E-4 (no date)1949 NU7 Aztec NU7

III. THE OLD TEPANEC DOMAIN

The seven provinces which are considered next are linked his- 635
torically by having been subject to the Tepanec tribe before the 175
formation of the Empire of the Mexica. We know this because the major towns of these seven provinces are listed in a very early colonial document—which will be referred to repeatedly hereafter—as being former subjects of Tlacopan [Tacuba].[1] Tlacopan, of course, inherited these towns when the major Tepanec center of Azcapotzalco was wiped out, a century before Cortés, and brought them as her dowry to the new Triple Alliance. This early document is the only known record which approximates a tribute list of the Tepanec Empire. It is supported—though such support is really needless—by the relación of Tecpatepec (1579),[2] one of the towns of this region, which tells us that Tecpatepec was settled by a venturesome Indian of Azcapotzalco about 1370.

These seven provinces are not all the former Tepanec domain—we have statements from towns of the Toluca area which were included also[3]—but they seem to have formed the heart of it, and they embrace the region about which we may be most dogmatic. It is, on the whole, both physiographically and culturally, a geographical entity, a gateway and frontier of the Chichimeca.

7. Quahuacan

sources of the map

Immediately to the west of Tlacopan, in the modern State of Mexico, 635
lay the province of Quahuacan. It is depicted on the tenth page of the 114
Matricula and on the copy of that page, folio 32ʳ of the *Codex Mendocino,* and includes thirteen towns. The present map is based on that of the Secretaría de Agricultura y Fomento, the 1:100,000 map, "Valle [128]
de México" (1937), on which nine towns of this province have been located.

---

[1] "Memorial de los pueblos subjetos a esta cabecera de tlacupan," published first in facsimile by Paso y Troncoso and printed in *ENE,* 14: 118.

[2] *PNE,* 6: 35.

[3] E.g., certain subjects of Teotenango: Atlatlauhca, Cepayauhtla, and Ciuhtepec. *GPM,* pp. 163–164.

TRIBUTE

651 *Tribute of the whole province.*—The following tribute was paid in pre-Conquest days by Quahuacan Province:

CLOTHING

241 800 bundles of rich mantles**
714 800 bundles of little mantles of henequen**
41 warriors' costumes with shields*

FOOD

262 4 wooden cribs (1 each of maize, beans, chian, and huauhtli)*

OTHER GOODS: TIMBER (quarterly)

313 1,200 large planks
1,200 large boards
1,200 poles (*quaumimilli*, morillos)

8. XOCOTITLAN

SOURCES OF THE MAP

635 Page 13 of the *Matricula* is divided into two sections, as has been
● 114 mentioned. The left-hand section contains the province of Malinalco,
175 the right-hand section that of Xocotitlan, with but a single town. The material concerning this one-town province is copied on the lower part of folio 35' of the *Codex Mendocino*. In both manuscripts, in addition to the glyph, its name appears in roman letters. Xocotitlan
128 (1) is located on the authority of the American Geographical Society's "Millionth Map," sheet "Ciudad de México," where it is spelled Jocotitlán. It lies in the modern State of Mexico, at the foot of the peak also called Jocotitlán. With Xocotitlan has been placed the town of Xiquipilco (2), a vaunted conquest of the Mexicans.[26] Five estancias were subject to Xocotitlan in the mid-sixteenth century,[27] which probably were under its jurisdiction pre-Hispanically. If these estancias could be located, they would define the frontier a little more precisely.

---

[26] Xocotitlan and Xiquipilco were conquered at the beginning of Axayacatl's reign, before the invasion of the Matlatzinca country, as the writer's forthcoming chronological study will show.

[27] *PNE*, 1: No. 799. These are Almolonga, Tlalchichilco, Tlamacuelpa, Tlalcuxpan, and Tlaxomulco.

8: Barlow E-4 (no date)1949 NU7 Aztec NU7

NATURE OF THE PROVINCE

Inhabitants and languages.—The inhabitants of present-day Xocotitlan and Xiquipilco speak Mazahua and Otomí[illegible]—a fact in harmony with Ixtlilxochitl's remarks concerning these people at the time of their incorporation into the Empire.[illegible] 197 101

Provincial borders in 1519.—Xocotitlan was a prolongation of the Empire frontier towards Michoacan, exposed to attack from the west and north. East of it lay the province of Quahuacan. 635 131

TRIBUTE

651

Tribute of the whole province.—The tribute of Xocotitlan is given as follows:

CLOTHING

400 little mantles of embroidered henequen** [391]

FOOD

4 large bins (1 each of maize, beans, huauhtli, and chian)*[illegible] [262]

Tribute of the component towns.—Xocotitlan (like the other diminutive province of Malinalco) gives us figures—lacking from most of the relaciones—for the tribute derived by the Mexicans from a single town, and these figures suggest that life under Mexican rule was arduous. 651 632

9. ATOTONILCO DE PEDRAZA

SOURCES OF THE MAP

The province of Atotonilco de Pedraza (not to be confused with that of Atotonilco el Grande) occupied with its list of towns the verso side of a lost page of the *Matricula*, as we may ascertain by the copy which forms folio 28ʳ of the *Mendocino*.[illegible] It consisted of seven pueblos, of which only the cabecera survives with its original name. Despite the plethora of Atotonilcos, we may be sure of the location of this particular town and of its corresponding province because references to one other pueblo listed, Otlazpan, have been found in old documents. The 635 114

[illegible] Soustelle, *La Famille Otomí-Pame du Mexique Central* (1937), *passim*.

[illegible] He puts them among Otomí, Mazahua, and Matlatzinca peoples. *Obras históricas* (1892), II: 296.

[illegible] See n. 111, p. 31.

[illegible] The lost original might be called p. 6B.

635 province of Atotonilco de Pedraza comprised small segments of the
114 north-central part of modern Mexico State and southwest Hidalgo. The map of Ortelius of 1579 has provided a few hints for the present one, as follows:

[103]

MENDOCINO	ORTELIUS, 1579
Atotonilco, 4	[No change]
Otlazpã, 1	Hatlaspa

Five of the towns, however, have vanished utterly and inexplicably. These are: Acocolco, Guapalcalco, Queçalmacã, Tehuehuec, and Xalac.

To compensate in a measure for these losses we may add two towns: Apaxco (3) and Tepexic (2).

REMARKS ON TOWNS

632 *Apaxco* is one of the towns subject to the Tepaneca of Tlacopan.

131 *Atotonilco,* still bearing its not very distinguished name, survives today; it is situated some twenty kilometers southeast of Tula. It has been given the arbitrary "apellido" of Pedraza in the present work, for ready identification. Maese Diego de Pedraza and, later, his son Melchor were encomenderos of the town in the sixteenth century.[illegible]

Otlazpan is a difficult problem, but one which must be solved so far as possible, since this and Atotonilco de Pedraza are the only two towns indicated on folio 28ʳ of the *Mendocino* which can be found, and Atotonilcos are confusingly abundant. Otlazpan appears on at least one early map, and it has been possible to unearth various references to it, some of as recent a date as 1800. It may be located with reasonable certainty, yet there is no clear evidence as to what happened to it.[illegible]

[illegible] *PNE,* 1: No. 1.

[illegible] The "Anales de Quauhtitlan" (Walter Lehmann, *Die Geschichte der Königreiche von Colhuacan und Mexico* [1938], vss. 470, 481, 629, etc.) cite it various times. The *Codex Osuna* (1878) gives its glyph (fol. 497-35), together with that of Tepexic and the legend "otlazpã, yhua tepesic ce comẽdero" ("Otlazpan and Tepexic, one encomendero"). A little-known codex, the *Mariano Jiménez* (1904), lists the salaries of the officials of Otlazpan in 1549. On the Ortelius map of thirty years later, it appears to the southwest of Tepeji del Río. Finally, a whole tome (No. 1201) of the Ramo de Tierras of the Archivo General de la Nación, México, is devoted to land disputes between Otlazpan and a neighbor. This contains documents from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries. The Códice Franciscano, written in 1570, cites (p. 15): "... otro monasterio fundado en termino de dos pueblos, los cuales se juntaron para lo edificar y poblar cabe él ... el uno Tepexico [Tepexic] ... el otro se llama Otlazpan."

The pueblo of Jagueyes disputed certain pastures with Otlazpan; 638
moreover, from the reference to the dispute it is clear that Tepexic, 131
Huehuetoca, and Otlazpan also had a common boundary at a hill
called Hueytepec.[illegible] The *Codex Mariano Jiménez* also deals in part
with the limits between Tepexic and Otlazpan. But whether we
should place Otlazpan north or south of the line formed by these three
pueblos is uncertain. The evidence is slightly in favor of the south.[illegible]

Tepexic figures among the towns subject to Tlacopan, in the list we have cited at the opening of this section.

NATURE OF THE PROVINCE

Inhabitants and languages.—It would appear[illegible] that the people of Otlaz- 197
pan and of its subject towns spoke Otomí and the related Mazahua, 579
whereas the inhabitants of Tepexic spoke Náhuatl. This division was 101
accompanied by an enmity the echoes of which lasted into recent
times in the form of a yearly stone-fight between the youths of the two
towns at a place called the "Puente de las Guerras."

Provincial borders in 1519.—Many of the towns of this province have 635
not been located, but its outline is known from the boundaries of its 131
neighbors. To the north of Atotonilco de Pedraza lay Xilotepec and
Axocopan provinces, to the east Hueypuchtla and Quauhtitlan, to the
south Quahuacan, and to the southwest Xocotitlan—all provinces of
the Empire.

[illegible] AGN, Tierras 1201, last document, p. 6, is a document of the Viceroy Martin Enriquez which bears the date May 12, 1576, and reads in part: "hago merced a melchoir muñez de vn sitio destancia para ganado menor entre los terminos de los pueblos de tepexi y utlaspa y huegetoca en vn cerro que llaman los yndios gueytepeque y en lengua castellana cerro grande a la parte del sur en vna barranca que baxa a vna quebrada grande que ba hazia san bernardino suxeto de utlaxpa." Folio 11ᵛ calls this hill "ococacaya hueytepec."

[illegible] Nicolás Léon (*Codex Mariano Jiménez*, p. 3) gives a list of subject towns of 114
Otlazpan—without any hint of his authority, of course—and names among them Tlautla and San Ildefonso. He also calls Otlazpan "San Juan." This would locate Otlazpan north of Tepexic. But in view of the frequent unreliability of Léon and his errors and oversights as editor of the *Mariano Jiménez*—he even overlooks the glyph of the town in the codex, fol. 6ᵛ, where the alcaldes are drawn with the treasure chest—more faith is probably to be placed in the Ortelius map, on which Otlazpan falls south of Tepexic. In the land dispute with Jagueyes, Otlazpan is called "San Francisco" (AGN, Tierras 1201, Cuaderno 5) and two subject ranchos are named, San Bernardino and El Maguey—undiscoverable, of course. Burial records of San Francisco [*sic*] "Ontlazpan," 1611–1615, are preserved in the Ayer Collection, Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois (Indian Linguistics Catalogue, No. 1468).

[illegible] According to Léon, *Codex Mariano Jiménez*, p. 3.

635 *Regional names.*—Atitlaquia and Apaxco lay in the margin of the ancient Teotlalpan, on which we have commented elsewhere.

TRIBUTE

651 *Tribute of the whole province.*—This obliterated province gave the following items of tribute:

CLOTHING

[291 400 bundles of rich mantles**
714] 400 bundles of mantles with black-and-white border**
800 bundles of large mantles of "twisted" cloth**
62 warriors' costumes, together with shields*

FOOD

[262] 4 wooden bins (1 each of maize, beans, huauhtli, and chian)*

OTHER GOODS

[317] 400 loads of lime**

651 632 *Tribute of the component towns.*—Atotonilco de Pedraza itself seems to have figured in the lime manufacture noted above.

317 Otlazpan, in 1549, paid tribute of lime, "mantas labradas con tochomitl," and many other articles, as we see in the *Codex Mariano Jiménez*. These must be the "mantillas de ricas labores ... ropa que bestian los S[eñore]s y caciques." *Tochomitl* is defined in the "Relaciones históricas estadísticas" (1:228) as "lana teñida de colores la qual dicha lana era conejos y liebres." (Compare with Tepechpa, p. 72.)

10. QUAUHTITLAN

SOURCES OF THE MAP

635 ● 114 Page 6 of the *Matricula* represents the once great province of Quauhtitlan, whose annals are so precious to the investigator of ancient Mexican history and ethnology. This page is copied as folio 26' of the *Codex Mendocino*. The province lay in the modern State of Mexico, north [128] of the Federal District. Seven towns are listed in this province, the present map of which is based on that of the Secretaría de Agricultura

---

Barlow, "Las provincias septentrionales del Impero de los Mexicanos," in *Tercera Reunión de Mesa Redonda sobre Problemas Antropológicos de México y Centro América, — 1943: El Norte de México y el sur de Estados Unidos* (1944), pp. 119–121.

PNE, 1: No. 1 [*ca.* 1550]: "Ay muchos magueyes y tunas y piedra para hazer cal y destas cosas tienen mucha grangeria los yndios." The whole region was abundant in lime.

8: Barlow E-4 (no date)1949 NU7 Aztec NU7

635

y Fomento ("Valle de México," 1937; scale, 1:100,000). The correspondence of old and modern names appears below: 114 [128]

MENDOCINO	1937 MAP
Cuezcomahuacã, 6	[See Remarks on Towns]
Quauhtitlan, 2	Cuauhtitlán
Tehuiloyocã, 4	Teoloyucan
Tepoxaco, 1	[No change]
Xiloçinco, 7	Xilotzingo

[103]

Two towns remain to be identified: Alhuexoyocã and Xalapan. On the other hand, we may add two other subject towns to the province: Huehuetoca (5) and Tepotzotlan (3).

REMARKS ON TOWNS

Cuezcomahuacan is said, in a document of 1570, to be subject to Tequixquiac; indeed, to be almost one with it.[illegible] 632 131

Huehuetoca figures in the list of subjects of Tlacopan.

Tehuiloyocan has become Teoloyucan and lies southeast of Huehuetoca. That it is the same pueblo is shown by the 1570 document, which places it "de este dicho pueblo de Güegüetocan una legua."[illegible]

Tepotzotlan is another of the former Tepanec towns.

Xalapan (not on the map) may possibly be the San Lorenzo Axalpan subject to Quauhtitlan.[illegible]

NATURE OF THE PROVINCE

Inhabitants and languages.—The rich and complicated history of the region is preserved in its annals, which cannot be summarized here. (Such a résumé may be found in Barlow's review of Velazquez' edition of *Códice Chimalpopoca,* in the *Hispanic-American Historical Review* [1947], 27:520–526.) Quauhtitlan, Xiloçinco, and Tepotzotlan figured eventually among the towns of the Tepaneca, however; and the Náhuatl tongue predominated. 197 635 175

Provincial borders in 1519.—Quauhtitlan lay in the heart of the Empire. To the northwest was Atotonilco de Pedraza, to the northeast Hueypuchtla, to the east the lacustrine towns, and to the southwest Quahuacan. 635 131

[illegible] *GPM,* p. 67: "distante de la cabecera cuatrocientos pasos: está esta hacia el sur."

[illegible] *GPM,* p. 263.

[illegible] *PNE,* 3: 33, nº 1.

651

TRIBUTE

Tribute of the whole province.—Rush mats and seats were a distinctive tribute of the province of Quauhtitlan, which paid the following items:

CLOTHING

[291 714] 400 bundles of rich little mantles**
400 bundles of little mantles with black-and-white border**
400 bundles of little white mantles**
62 warriors' costumes with shields (2 fine pieces)*

FOOD

[262] 4 wooden bins (1 each of maize, beans, chian, and huauhtli)*

OTHER TRIBUTE

[285] 4,000 *petates*
4,000 rush seats

11. XILOTEPEC

SOURCES OF THE MAP

635 114 The province of Xilotepec, which kept its name into the late sixteenth century, contained seven towns, according to page 9 of the *Matricula* and folio 31ʳ of the *Mendocino*. It lay in the southwest part of Hidalgo and in the northwest part of the State of Mexico. In the *Matricula*, the towns of Xilotepec and Michmaloyan are identified in roman letters; in the *Mendocino*, all are. The present map is based on the "Millionth [.78] Map" of the American Geographical Society, sheets "San Luis Potosí" and "Ciudad de México." Below are the *Mendocino* names which have been identified with those of the modern map:

103

MENDOCINO	MILLIONTH MAP
Acaxochitla, 7	[Missing]
Michmaloyan, 5	Michimaloyan
Tecoçauhtla, 11	Tecozautla
Tepetitlan, 6	Tepetitlán
Tzayanalquilpan, 3	Soyaniquilpan
Xilotepec, 2	Jilotepec

There remains a seventh town to identify in this province: Tlachco. It is possible that this may be the modern Querétaro, for the Mexican version of Querétaro (more properly "Querendaro" in Tarascan) is

Tlachco, as we see in the "Descripción de Querétaro." However, it is not really clear that Querétaro is a pre-Hispanic town. The impression given by the relación is that it was founded as a result of the Spanish invasion. And evidence that Querendaro-Tlachco is not the Tlachco of the *Matricula* is found in the same relación, in the list of "mojoneras" lying between Querétaro and Xilotepec. Tlachco, therefore, remains a puzzle. 632 114

We may add a few towns to those of the *Matricula*, and establish the western frontier of the province, on the authority of the sixteenth-century relaciones: Atlan (9), Hueichiapan (10), Nopala (8), Titlmilpa (1), and Zimapan (12). 635 632

REMARKS ON TOWNS

Acaxochitla may be found in the Secretaría de Agricultura atlas. 632

Titlmilpa seems to be the best form for the name which Orozco y Berra transcribes from the same document (in his *Geography*, p. 258) as "Tiltmilpa." Today it is Timilpan.

NATURE OF THE PROVINCE

Inhabitants and languages.—The province of Xilotepec was populated by the Otomí. One early writer calls them "barbarous compared to the Mexicans," but admits that they are not nomads like their Chichimec neighbors. These "barbarous" people of Xilotepec Province, it should be pointed out, produced the only known codex with an Otomí (instead of a Mexican) text, possibly under the stimulus of 635 [197] 101 212

In Primo Feliciano Velázquez, ed., *Colección de documentos para la historia de San Luis Potosí* (1897–1899), I: 1–48.

The series appears thus in the "Descripción de Querétaro," in Velázquez, ed., *Colección de documentos para ... San Luis Potosí*, I: 13: "tiera su mojonera con los de Xilotepec los pueblos siguientes santiago tecaçautla, sanct matheo gueichiapa, sant joseph atla," which have been located. Then follow three towns which have not been identified: "santa maría theculul yeucxie san geronimo acaguilcingo san lorenço techatitla"; and the list ends with "san andres titlmepa," the Timilpan of today. Acaguilcingo seems to be better rendered in a document published by Simpson (*Studies in the Administration of the Indians in New Spain*, Ibero-Americana [1934], No. 7, p. 48), where it is given as "San Geronimo Acagualcingo." *ENE*, 14: 119, gives "Acaxalzinco."

PNE, 6: 3: "en tiempo de su gentilidad obedecían los naturales destos pueblos al señor de Jilotepec ... en cuyo reconocimiento le davan de la caça que mataban."

"La provincia que llaman de Xilotepec, la cual es toda de indios otomís, que son bárbaros en respecto de los mexicanos, y así no tienen tanta policía, y confinan con los chichimecas, que son como alárabes y estan todavía de guerra" (García Icazbalceta, ed., *Nueva colección de documentos para la historia de México* [1886–1892], II: 18).

Tribute of the component towns.—A little more detail on tribute appears in the "Descripción de Querétaro," which remarks the abject subservience of Xilotepec Province to its masters, the tribute of mantles and game, and the brutality of the tax collectors. 651 632

12. AXOCOPAN

SOURCES OF THE MAP

The province of Axocopan was depicted on one of two leaves of the *Matricula* which have disappeared completely. It must have occupied the recto side of a leaf between those representing the provinces of Quauhtitlan and Hueypuchtla, since it is preserved for us in this location in the copy of the *Mendocino Codex,* folio 27ʳ. Axocopan Province lay in the southwest part of the territory belonging to modern Hidalgo State. Its towns have been located on the basis of the sheet "San Luis Potosí" of the American Geographical Society's "Millionth Map," supplemented by the Hidalgo map of the atlas of the Secretaría de Agricultura y Fomento. The equivalents between ancient names and those of the "Millionth Map" are noted below: 635 114+ [128]

[103]

MENDOCINO	MILLIONTH MAP
Atenco, 5	[Missing]
Axocopan, 1	[Missing]
Mizquiyahuala, 7	Mixquiahuala
Tecpatepec, 8	[No change]
Temohuayā, 2	[Missing]
Tetepanco, 3	Tetepango
Tezcatepec, 9	[Missing]
Tlaahuililpā, 4	Tlahuelilpa
Xochichiuca	[Missing]
Yzmiquilpā, 10	Ixmiquilpan

Despite the absence of many names from the "Millionth Map," and of some from both maps used, all these towns have been located. We may even add to them the following town: Tezontepec (6).

"Descripción de Querétaro," in Velázquez, ed., *Colección de documentos para ... San Luis Potosí* (1897–1899), I: 33: "en tiempo de su gentilidad [los de Xilotepec] eran sujetos á los señores de mexico á los cuales adoraban como a dioses ... tributabanles todo lo que podía cada vno ó lo que querían los que lo recogían daban mantas gallinas codornices conejos y sobre esto les apremiauan los cojedores con açotes y otros malos tratamientos."

Regarding the missing pages, see Introduction, pp. 6–7. This vanished *Matricula* original may be called p. 6A of that codex.

651 tula ... Ansi mismo estavan sujetos al de mexico donde estava y rresidia [235] montesuma q̄ en aquellos tiempos hera señor dellos, y la davan de tributo cada un yndio una gallina desta tierra cada veinte dias y unas mantas de nequen y todos en general chicos y grandes hazian lo mismo" (RHE, 1:253).

[257] Tecpatepec paid henequen mantles and skirts, deer horns, and game, as well as making a special milpa.[illegible]

[411 281] Tezcatepec paid tribute of game, bows and arrows, and deerskins.[illegible]

13. HUEYPUCHTLA

SOURCES OF THE MAP

635 114 ● On page 7 of the *Matricula* and on folio 29ʳ of the *Codex Mendocino* appears the province of Hueypuchtla, which included south-central Hidalgo and a tiny segment of north-central Mexico. The present map [123] is based on the American Geographical Society's Millionth Map, "San Luis Potosí" and "Ciudad de México." In the *Matricula,* only the cabecera is identified in roman letters; in the *Mendocino,* all towns are. The following have been identified:

103

MENDOCINO	MILLIONTH MAP
Acayocā, 7	Acayoca
Atocpan, 10	Actopan
Hueypuchtla, 3	Hueypoxtla
Tequixquiac, 1	[No change]
Tetlapanaloyā, 2	Tlapanaloya
Tezcatepectonco, 6	[See Remarks on Towns]
Xicalhuacan (? 4)	[See Remarks on Towns]
Xomeyocan (? 5)	[See Remarks on Towns]

One pueblo of the *Matricula* remains unidentified: Xalac.

On the other hand, we may add two more towns with certainty to this province: Itzcuincuitlapilco (8) and Tolnacuchtla (9).

REMARKS ON TOWNS

632 131 *Atocpan* has become the Actopan of today. Although there still exists another town called Atocpan (southeast of Hueypuchtla), ours is the

---

[illegible] *PNE,* 6: 36: "dauan de tributo mantas de nequen y naguas, cueros de venado, venados, liebres, conejos y codornizes, y le hazian vna sementera de mahiz."

[illegible] *PNE,* 6: 32: "rreconoçian a Moctezuma ... davanle de tributo venados, conejos, liebres, culebras, arcos, flechas, pellejos de venados."

IV. THE OLD ACOLHUA DOMAIN: THE NORTH

JUST AS THE PRECEDING GROUP of provinces may be linked con- 635
veniently as the Old Tepanec Domain, those which we are about 114
to consider belong predominantly to another member of the triumvirate, Acolhuacan Texcoco. The chief authority for this is the chronicler Ixtlilxochitl, who tells us in some detail how Nezahualcoyotl placed governors and mayordomos in Cuauhchinanco, Tuchpa, and other towns we shall consider—enough to imply that the whole northeast was under the dominion of the Acolhuaque in late pre-Hispanic days. He explains that these were the towns "allotted to the realm of Texcoco, the other two kings having no share in them."[1] Though Ixtlilxochitl is accused of mendacious nationalism, we may accept his word, inasmuch as such sources as a list of pueblos subject to Texcoco[2] and the conquest lists of that city-state, which the writer will publish later in a chronology of the Empire, confirm his statements absolutely.

14. OXITIPAN

SOURCES OF THE MAP

The last leaf of the *Matricula* as it exists today (p. 28) deals with the province of Ctzicoac (*Mendocino*, fol. 55ʳ). Following this page there was originally at least one more leaf in the *Matricula*—a leaf which is known only from the *Mendocino* copy. At this point in the *Mendocino* appear the words "fin de la parte segunda," that is, the end of the tribute section of this tripartite codex. Presumably the lost *Matricula* leaf was blank upon its verso when the *Mendocino* copyist had it before him, or he would not have written "fin." The long array of tributaries ended here.

What must have been the recto of the original leaf not only is the 131
end of the manuscript, but also represents the end of the Empire of 635
the Mexica, as far as the north is concerned, for there is but one town 114

---

[1] "Esta provincia y las demas en donde puso sus mayordomos y cobradores, fueron las que se ajudicaron al reino de Tezcuco, sin entrar en participacion los otros dos reyes" (Ixtlilxochitl, *Obras históricas* [1892], II: 198).

[2] In the *Anales del Museo Nacional de … México*, Epoca I (1897), 4: 48–51 and Lehmann, *Die Geschichte der Königreiche von Colhuacan und Mexico* (1938), vs. 1343, among other places.

8: Barlow E-4 (no date)1949 NU7 Aztec NU7

635 ● 114 [31] represented on this page, and it was the most northerly of the whole vast Empire. This town is marked Oxitipan in the *Mendocino* copy, which is all we have. The following equation has been made:

Oxitipan, 1	Ojitipa de Mirador

[651] Many other towns must have been reckoned in with Oxitipan, to judge from the figures for pre-Hispanic and colonial tribute, which differ enormously. (Four hundred loads of *axi* compared with thirty, for example.)

REMARKS ON TOWNS

632 Though Oxitipan is described as lying eight leagues to the west of what is now Ciudad Valles,[3] it is clear that the reporter had his directions mixed. Ojitipa de Mirador is the same distance south, being a rancho of the municipio of Tancanhuitz, in the extreme southeast of the State of San Luis Potosí. The name of a stream flowing near Tancanhuitz is Oxitipan—another instance of the survival of this once important place name. Ciudad Valles was originally the Villa de Santiago de los Valles de Oxitipan.[4]

NATURE OF THE PROVINCE

635 114 *Inhabitants and languages.*—Although we have no specific description of Oxitipan from early times, an English *pochtecatl* named Chilton gives an account from 1572 dealing with near-by areas to the east and north, that is, Tancuaylab and the modern Ciudad Valles.

Chilton writes:[5]

> 635 105 The first town we came unto is called Tancuylabo, in which there dwell many Indians, high of stature, having all their bodies painted with blew, and weare their haire long down to their knees, tied as women use to doe with their haire-laces. When they go out of their doores, they cary with them their bowes and arrows, being very great archers, going for the most part naked. In those countreys they take neither golde nor silver for exchange of any thing, but onely Salt, which they greatly esteeme, and use it for a principall medicine for certain wormes which breed in their lips and in their gummes.

---

[3] *PNE*, 1: No. 424: "Confina con Tambolon"—now a rancho of Valles.

[4] Meade, *La Huasteca: Epoca Antigua* (1942), p. 293.

[5] Chilton's narrative in Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations . . . of the English Nation* (Everyman's Library, 1907), VI:275.

177
651

OTHER GOODS

... cotton
60 deerskins[9]

15. Cтzicoac

SOURCES OF THE MAP

635 The province of Cтzicoac (Tziccoac would be a less eccentric spelling) ● 114 is represented on the last, damaged page of the *Matricula* as it survives today, that is, on page 28, the following leaf being lost. Fortunately, this badly damaged leaf was copied and preserved for us long ago in the *Codex Mendocino* (fol. 54ʳ). This former province of the Empire of the Mexica, which contained five principal towns, is now divided between northern Hidalgo and Veracruz, together with a small corner of San Luis Potosí. The present map is based on the "Millionth Map" [128] of the American Geographical Society, sheet "San Luis Potosí," which gives the following equivalents:

103

MENDOCINO	MILLIONTH MAP
Cozcatecutlan, 1	Coxcatlan
Cтzicoac (?), 5	[See Remarks on Towns]
Molanco, 7	[See Remarks on Towns]
Xocoyocan (?), 6	[See Remarks on Towns]
Ychcatlan, 3	Ixcatlan

We may add Tampatel, near Tantoyuca—Number 79 of the complete list of Empire conquests—and Tamapachco (8), Number 88. These were conquered by Axayacatl and Tizoc respectively. It is [648] probably safe to fill in the map with Chapulhuacan (2) and Huexotla de Hidalgo (4), which warred with independent Metztitlan.[10]

REMARKS ON TOWNS

632 *Cozcatecutlan* is assumed to be the modern Coxcatlan near Tancan-131 huitz, though it is mentioned in the "Anales de Cuauhtitlan" along with towns of the Chicontepec area. Indeed, if it fell in Chicontepec, the whole eastern half of this province would be doubtful, and the question of the northern boundaries of Metztitlan, as well as that of Mexican communication with Oxitipan, would remain open.

---

[9] *PNE*, 1: No. 424.
[10] "Relación de ... Meztitlan," p. 113, and *PNE*, 6: 188.

Ctzicoac, which is also called Xiuhcoac, Tziuhcoac, and Cicoaque, is another difficult problem. Meade[31] would locate it in or near the present Chicontepec; Melgarejo[32] presents considerable evidence that it is the modern Dr. Montes de Oca, formerly called San Isidro. The writer regards the problem as not yet completely solved, and prefers to indicate both possibilities on the map. 632 131

Huexotla de Hidalgo, which carried on war with Metztitlan, had Náhua gods and a cacique with a Náhua name. Geographic logic and the wars alluded to would place it within the Empire, though there is no absolute evidence that it was included. As the myopic "Relación de Huexotla" speaks only of the local chief, this town may possibly have been an independent city-state.[33] [645]

Molanco is identified by Melgarejo as a "congregación de 159 habitantes en Izhuatlan de Madero." This seems to have been formed from a pre-Hispanic Tecpan Molanco, four leagues distant"[34]—direction not specified. Tecpan Molanco is probably the *Matricula* pueblo and is mentioned in the "Anales de Cuauhtitlan." A homonym formed an integral part of the señorío of Metztitlan, according to the relación of that town.

Tamapachco, a hybrid Huaxtec-Náhua word, appears in the conquest lists of Tizoc. Since the subjugation of this town is mentioned jointly with the conquest of Miqyetlan (Mictlan), Tamapachco is presumably the modern Temapache. A homonym lying southwest of Aquismon was still called Tamapach in the eighteenth century.[35] We have put the northern frontier in this region at Temapache, though recognizing that Bernal Díaz speaks of a map in Moctezuma's possession which depicted the coast as far as Panuco. [175] [114]

NATURE OF THE PROVINCE

Inhabitants and languages.—As in the central Balsas basin, the Mexica could not or would not conquer the hot lowlands. The Río Panuco and its tributaries, the Moctezuma and Chicayan, lay outside the Em- 635 648 197

---

[31] *Op. cit.*, p. 290.

[32] *La provincia de Tzicoac* (1947), pp. 36–42.

[33] *PNE*, 6: 183–192.

[34] Melgarejo, *La provincia de Tzicoac* (1947), pp. 42, 53, and 63, cites AGN, Tierras, Tomo 1691, p. 263.

[35] Velázquez, ed., *Colección de documentos para la historia de San Luis Potosí* (1897–1899), IV: 273.

8: Barlow E-4 (no date)1949 NU7 Aztec NU7

16. Tuchpa

SOURCES OF THE MAP

635 114 The *Matricula* leaf containing Tuchpa Province upon its verso was one of the two leaves carried to Philadelphia a century ago.[29] It is copied on folio 52ʳ of the *Codex Mendocino*. The seven towns of Tuchpa [128] Province now form part of north-central Veracruz State. The present map is based on the "Millionth Map" of the American Geographical Society, sheet "San Luis Potosí." The *Mendocino* names which have been located appear below:

103

MENDOCINO	MILLIONTH MAP
Miahuaapã, 4	Miahuapam
Mictlan, 3	[See Remarks on Towns]
Papantla, 6	[No change]
Tuchpa, 2	Tuxpan
Çihuateopa, 5	[See Remarks on Towns]

Two towns of the *Mendocino* list remain unlocated: Oçelotepec and Tlatiçapã.

To these we may safely add the town of Tenexticpac (1).

REMARKS ON TOWNS

632 131 *Mictlan* is "heute ein Weiler bei Castillo de Teayo" (a), according to Lehmann.[30] It is called "Miquetlan" or even "Miquiyetlan" in certain ancient documents.[31]

Oçelotepec might be the modern Ozuluama, north of the frontier which we give, but this remains to be established.

Papantla claimed to have been independent until reduced by Moctezuma II[32]—an assertion which agrees with reports of the rebellious conditions Cortés found on the east coast. The jurisdiction of Papantla

---

[29] See Introduction, p. 7.

[30] Lehmann, *Die Geschichte der Königreiche von Colhuacan und Mexico* (1938), p. 308, n. 2. On the famous fortifications at Castillo de Teayo (a), possibly a garrison of the empire we are describing, see Seler, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur Amerikanischen Sprach- und Alterthumskunde* (1902–1923), II: 272 and III: 410–449.

[31] Lehmann, vs. 1348 D5, and the conquest lists of Tizoc.

[32] RHE, 1: 488: "tenian estos yndios antiguamente un governador puesto por monteçuma que los tenia en paz y que antes que monteçuma nasçiese ni eredase este rreyno no estauan estos yndios subjetos al padre de monteçuma ni á otra persona y que tenian guerra con el y defendian sus tierras ... y que despues vinieron desde á muchos años que ya estavan cansados de defender sus tierras é terminos se dieron briamente á monteçuma."

651 816 bundles[illegible] of orange-striped mantles, 8 brazas long**
[291] 408 bundles[illegible] of large white mantles, 8 brazas long**
402 bundles[illegible] of mantles striped red and yellow**
400 bundles of women's skirts and blouses**
240 bundles of rich mantles in three styles**
[714] 2 warriors' costumes with shields*

FOOD*

[262] 800 loads of dried chili peppers

OTHER GOODS*

[237 20 bags of small white feathers for decorating mantles
301] 2 strings of chalchiuites
1 string of turquoises
2 disks of turquoise mosaic

Another source, which magnifies the seven towns into seven prov- [114] inces in the "gran provincia de Tochpan"[illegible] (seventy-eight pueblos in all), gives the following version:

CLOTHING

[291] 1,580 bundles of mantles
25 mantles and *huipiles*
400½ bundles of "twisted" mantles, 8 brazas long
400½ bundles of thin "twisted" mantles, 4 brazas long

This is summed up as 47,645 articles of clothing, a smaller figure [357] than that given by the *Mendocino*.[illegible] Perhaps we have here the tribute of the cabecera alone. Servants were also supplied, we are told.[illegible]

Still other sources give more details concerning items included in the opulent tribute of Tuchpa Province, among them a kind of mantle called "Tuchpanecayotl."[illegible]

[illegible] Corrected from 800.

[illegible] Corrected from 400.

[illegible] Corrected from 400.

[illegible] Ixtlilxochitl, *Obras históricas* (1892), II: 197. It is interesting that the number seven is given, which corresponds to the number of towns known to us from the *Mendocino*.

[illegible] The total number of pieces of clothing from Tuchpa Province specified in the *Mendocino* is 85,480.

[illegible] Ixtlilxochitl, *Obras históricas* (1892), II: 197: "En la gran provincia de Tochpan puso por su mayordomo á Huehuetli, que cobraba en cada un año de las mantas del género atrás referido, mil quinientos y ochenta fardos, y mas veinticinco mantas y huepiles, sin más cuatrocientos fardos, y más diez mantas de ilacatzinhqui [Molina: cosa torcida] de a ocho brazas, y otros tantos fardos de mantas de ilacatzinhqui delgado de a cuatro brazas, que por todo venían á ser cuarenta y siete mil seiscientos cuarenta y cinco mantas, enaguas y huepiles, piezas de ilacatzinhqui y pañetes sin más las amas de palacio y criadas que eran necesarias para el servicio. La gran provincia de Tochpan se dividía en siete provincias, que contenían todas ellas setenta y ocho pueblos a ellas sujetos."

[illegible] Tezozomoc, *Crónica mexicana* (1878), p. 315. See also Krickeberg, *Los totonaca* (1933), pp. 110–111.

8: Barlow E-4 (no date)1949 NU7 Aztec NU7

Tribute of the component towns.—Papantla paid a tribute of mantles, little peppers, maize, and chili." 631 632

17. Atlan

SOURCES OF THE MAP

On page 27 of the *Matricula,* which is copied as folio 53ʳ of the *Codex Mendocino,* appears a province of two towns, the second such province which we have encountered." In the former codex, one place glyph is identified as "Atla" (1); the other is left unnamed. In the *Mendocino* they are identified as "Atlan" and "Teçapotitlan." The town of Atlan appears at the northern tip of Puebla State, in the atlas of the Secretaría de Agricultura y Fomento. Both are listed among the very numerous tributaries of Huauchinango, four leagues distant, in one document which gives Atlan one hundred and fifty tributaries and "Çapotitlan" ten only." Elsewhere both are said to be of the *partido* of Metaltoyuca (2). In the latter document Teçapotitlan is also called "Valpopocatlan."" 635 104

NATURE OF THE PROVINCE

Provincial borders in 1519.—Atlan and Teçapotitlan were apparently the great Mexican bulwarks of the northeast. These two towns are treated in the same way as are Xoconochco, at the southern extremity of the Empire on the Pacific, and Oztoma, on the west, in that the glyph of each town appears on a preliminary leaf of the *Matricula* accompanied by the glyph of a special governor, who held the rank of "tlacochcalcatl," or "tlacochtectli," as the *Mendocino* annotator puts it. Atlan and one other province (Quechaltenanco, in Guerrero) each had but one governor; the five other regions distinguished in this manner each had two. 635 131

Bernal Díaz speaks of a garrison which seems to be that of Atlan, when he refers to "…otra capitania…a la rraya de panuco, Entre tuçapan [? Tuchpa] y vn pueblo que le pusimos por nonbre almeria [Nautla], ques En la costa del norte….""

ENE, 1: 488: "tributabanle mantas y pepitas y mahiz y chile."

Cf. Malinalco, above.

PNE, 3: 97.

ENE, 8: 160.

Historia verdadera de la conquista de la Nueva España (1904), I: 302. See fuller quotation from Díaz in note 1, p. 128.

635 131 Atlan was nearly surrounded by other Empire provinces: Ctzicoac to the northwest, Tuchpa to the northeast and east, and Tlapacoyan to the south. West of it lay Tototepec de Veracruz, seemingly an independent city-state.

TRIBUTE

651 *Tribute of the whole province.*—The following tribute was paid by the small frontier province of Atlan to its masters, the Mexica:

CLOTHING**

[291]
800 bundles of rich red and white mantles, bordered in red, blue, and yellow
800 bundles of loincloths
404 bundles** of large white mantles, 4 brazas long

OTHER GOODS*

[248] 1,200 bundles of cotton

18. TLAPACOYAN

SOURCES OF THE MAP

635 114 The province of Tlapacoyan occupies page 26 of the *Matricula,* copied as folio 50' of the *Codex Mendocino.* It contains the seven principal towns of a province now forming part of northern Puebla State. In the *Matricula* the cabecera alone is identified in roman letters; in the *Mendocino,* all towns are. The present map is based on the Puebla map of the Comisión Geográfico-Exploradora (1908). A list of the ancient place names, together with their modern equivalents, is given below:

[103]

MENDOCINO	1908 MAP
Acaçacatla, 7	Zacatlan
Tlapacoyan, 4	[No change]
Xiloxochitlan, 6	Eloxochitlan
Xochiquauhtitlan, 5	Xochicuatla

These three remain to be located: Aztaapan, Coapan, and Tuchtlan.

To this province may be added: Cuauhchinanco (2), Chila (3), and Xicotepec (1).

REMARKS ON TOWNS

632 *Acaçacatla* can hardly be other than the Zacatlan of today.

131 *Cuauhchinanco* was one of the fourteen cabeceras of the Acolhuaque.

** Corrected from 400.

TRIBUTE

651 *Tribute of the whole province.*—Tlapacoyan paid the following tribute to its Mexican masters:

CLOTHING

[291 400 bundles of black-and-white striped mantles**
714] 800 bundles of large white mantles**
2 warriors' costumes*

651 *Tribute of the component towns.*—Acaçacatla, if we are correct in
632 identifying it with the modern Zacatlán, gave no tribute other than a few judicious gifts.[30]

Chila paid, as might be expected from the *Matricula* leaf, a tribute of cotton mantles.[31]

19. ATOTONILCO EL GRANDE

SOURCES OF THE MAP

635 The glyphs for Atotonilco and its five fellow towns appear on page 8
114 of the *Matricula* and is copied on folio 30ʳ of the *Codex Mendocino.* There is an Empire province of Atotonilco which may be called the province of Atotonilco de Pedraza (see p. 37 above), but the one represented on folio 30ʳ may be named after the town within it which is indicated by the *Matricula* annotator as Atotonilco el Grande—the only town he identifies on this page. The towns of this province lay in the south-central part of eastern Hidalgo. The *Mendocino,* as usual, identifies all towns, and has been compared with the modern map
[128] (American Geographical Society, "Millionth Map," sheet "San Luis Potosí") with the following result:

103

MENDOCINO	MILLIONTH MAP
Acaxochitla, 3	Acaxochitlán
Atotonilco, 1	Atotonilco el Grande
Hueyapan, 5	[No change]
Quachqueçaloyā, 2	[See Remarks on Towns]
Tulançinco, 4	Tulancingo
Çtzihuinquiloca	[See Remarks on Towns]

---

[30] RHE, 1: 469: "no tributaban como otros pueblos mas de que quando ellos querian hazer algun presente á moctecuma lo hazian y no otra cosa."

[31] RHE, 1: 481: "antiguamente tributauan á montecuma mantas de algodon."

651
[262]

FOOD

4 wooden bins (1 each of maize, beans, chian, and huauhtli)[*]

632
651

Tribute of the component towns.—Atotonilco el Grande, in the mid-sixteenth century, gave six hundred *hanegas* of maize annually and twenty-six hanegas of wheat. Quarterly it paid twenty-five women's skirts and twenty-five blouses, as well as fish, quail, chicken eggs, kindling, personal services, and a host of minor items.[*]

20. ACOLHUACAN

SOURCES OF THE MAP

635
114

The province which is represented on page 3 of the *Matricula* is depicted on folios 21ᵛ and 22ᵛ of the *Codex Mendocino* copy. It contained twenty-six pueblos worth enumerating. Several of the glyphs are almost obliterated in the *Matricula*, which identifies four towns in roman letters. Three of these identifications—Ixquemaca, Ahuatepec, and Cempoala—agree well enough with the *Mendocino*, which identifies all the towns, but the name of the cabecera is quite different in the two manuscripts. The *Matricula* calls it "Acolman"; the *Mendocino* calls it "Acolhuacan." In the ensuing discussion, Remarks on Towns, the problem is considered. This province lay mostly within the territory now included in the State of Mexico, northeast of Lake Texcoco, [28] but projected a short distance into Hidalgo. With the 1937 map, "Valle de México" (Secretaría de Agricultura y Fomento), used as base, more than half the towns of this province have been identified:

103

MENDOCINO	1937 MAP
Acolhuacā, 23	[See Remarks on Towns]
Aztaquemeca	[See Remarks on Towns]
Cenpoalan, 5	Zempoala
Ecatepec, 15	[No change]
Epaçoyucā, 2	[See Remarks on Towns]
Huiçilan, 9	Huitzilac
Matixco, 14	Maquixco
Teacalco, 11	[See Remarks on Towns]
Temazcalapā, 10	Temaxcalapan
Tepechpa, 16	Tepexpan

---

[*] *PNE*, 1: No. 21: "Y da mas seyscientas hanegas de maiz cada año y siembran veinte y siete hanegas de trigo, y dan veinte e cinco naguas y otras tantas camisas cada ochenta dias."

MENDOCINO	1937 MAP
Tepetlaoztoc, 18	Tepetlaoxtoc
Teçoyucã, 17	Tezoyuca
Tiçayucã, 8	Tizayuca
Tlaquilpã, 3	[See Remarks on Towns]
Tonanytla, 12	Tonanitla

Various pueblos of this crowded province remain to be located:

- Ahuatepec
- Ameyalco
- Calyahualco
- Contlan
- Quauhq̃mecã
- Quauhyocan
- Tepetlapã
- Tiçatepec
- Tlachyahualco
- Totolçinco
- Yxquemecã

Certain other pueblos may be added to the province on the basis of other documents:

- Acolman (a)
- Coatepec Chalco, 22
- Chicualoapan, 21
- Chimalhuacantoyac, 20
- Otompan, 24
- Pachuca, 1
- Teotihuacan, 13
- Tepepulco, 7
- Tetlyztaca, 6
- Tezontepec, 4

REMARKS ON TOWNS

Acolman (a) was independent until conquered by Nezahualcoyotl of 632 Texcoco.[*]

Acolhuacan is something of a problem. The present paper is hardly the place to pass upon the truth of reports that Texcoco, capital of the Acolhuaque, paid tribute to the Mexica as did any other vassal. But a choice is imperative here: does the glyph which is annotated Acol*man* and Acol*huacan* represent Acolhuacan Texcoco?

The answer is a certain no. It is doubtful that Texcoco ever paid the 632 famous tribute, in the first place. The other member of the Triple 114 Alliance, Tlacopan, does not figure as a tributary anywhere in the *Matricula,* and it was less powerful than the domain of Nezahualpilli. The *Mendocino* interpreter has not written Texcoco, nor does the glyph correspond to those commonly used for Texcoco.[*] And the contradictory *Matricula* legend has been written over, as if to avoid

---

[*] "Nezahualcoyotzin cacique de Tezcuco, los tiranizo" (*PNE,* 6: 211).

(1942), fig. I.

632 one interpretation, at least: the word "tetzcocatl" has been altered in 114 two places to read "acolmecatl"; that is, "men of Texcoco" has been erased. Further evidence that Acolhuacan was neither Acolman nor Texcoco may be found in the lists of conquests in which Huitzihuitl and Itzcoatl participated.

If the glyph does not represent Acolhuacan Texcoco, what Acolhuacan does it mean? Discarding a vague possibility that it may be Acolman, site of the great monastery, the writer prefers to follow the "Relación de Coatepec-Chalco," which informs us explicitly that Acolhuacan is a former name of Coatlichan.

632 The *Mendocino* adds the name of the tribute collector, or "calpixqui," to the place name: it was (rather suspiciously) "Acolmecatl."

Aztaquemeca (not on the map) lay athwart Cortés' escape route after the Noche Triste. His itinerary, as given in Sahagún and in the "Lienzo de Tlaxcala," reads Tepotzotlan–Aztaquemecan–Zacapulco–Tonanixco, and finally, friendly Hueyotlipan. Aztaquemeca may be the Ixtacamecan Santo Domingo, half a league from Otumba (24).

Coatepec Chalco bore a "very special enmity" toward Chalco, to the south, which is enough to align it on our map with the province of Acolhuacan.

Chicualoapan "and its subjects were subject to the caciques and lords of the pueblo and cabecera of Coatlychan."

Chimalhuacantoyac had once belonged to the ex-province of Chalco, but was annexed by "the province of Aculhuacan, which is Coatlychan."

Epaçoyucan, which can be found on the Hidalgo map of the Secretaría de Agricultura y Fomento atlas, was earlier called Tomazquitlac. It belonged to Acolhuacan from a very early date.

For this possibility, see *PNE*, 6: 213, n. 2.

PNE, 6: 80: "Coatlychan, que en aquel tiempo se dezia Aculhuacan ... ." See Chimalhuacantoyac, below.

PNE, 3: 83 and n. 1; Ixtlilxochitl, *Obras históricas* (1892), I: 304, "Azquemeca," near Axapusco.

PNE, 6: 51: "tubo muy particular enemystad con los de la probinçia de Chalco, a los quales dió muchas guerras."

PNE, 6: 82–83. See Acolhuacan, above.

PNE, 6: 66: "heran las tierras de los yndios de la provinçia de Chalco, y al presente [1579] este pueblo y sus subjetos estan en la comarca y provinçia de Aculhuacan, que es Coatlychan."

"Eran del señorio de tezcuco como decienden de los chichimecos de tezcuco siempre reconocian de sus mayores que llaman el reyno de acolhuacan" (RHE, 1: 141–142).

8: Barlow E-4 (no date)1949 NU7 Aztec NU7

V. THE OLD ACOLHUA DOMAIN: THE SOUTHWEST

THERE is a variety of evidence for ascribing a principal role to the 631
Acolhuaque in the parts of Morelos and Guerrero we are about 648
to examine. A list of towns paying tribute to Texcoco[1] names 175
nine towns of the Cuernavaca area—a situation fully confirmed by Ixtlilxochitl, who relates the invasion of this region by Empire troops and adds, "cupieron á Nezahualcoyotzin con la cabecera de Quauhnahuac nueve pueblos."[2] (Some of these nine pueblos are in Quauhnahuac Province; others, however, are in adjacent Huaxtepec.) Ixtlilxochitl also tells how Nezahualcoyotl overran Tlalcoçauhtitlan and placed a governor over it.[3]

To the nucleus of three provinces (Quauhnahuac, Huaxtepec, and [128]
Tlalcoçauhtitlan) which the Acolhuaque certainly dominated, two others have been added (Chalco and Quiauhteopan). Their inclusion in this section is based on inference, a wish to maintain symmetry, the need of avoiding too many subdivisions, and the absence of conflicting evidence. It may be a great indiscretion.

21. CHALCO

SOURCES OF THE MAP

On the nineteenth page of the *Matricula* and folio 41^r of the *Codex* 635
Mendocino appears the province of Chalco, containing six principal 114
towns, which lay in the south of the Valley of Mexico and reached down to the Valley of Morelos. Chalco is a province which presents several problems. Documents are curiously lacking, despite the great pre-Hispanic importance of the province. There is no sixteenth-century relación, for example, and maps of today are not very useful, but on the 1927 map of the "Estado de México" three of the towns have been [128]
identified, as follows:

MENDOCINO	1927 MAP	[163]
Chalco, 1	Tlalmanalco	
Quauhxumulco, 2	Cuajomulco	
Tepuztlan, 3	Tepoztlan	

---

[1] Lehmann, vs. 1343.
[2] Ixtlilxochitl, *Obras históricas* (1892), II: 196.
[3] Quoted in n. 36 below.

635 103 Three others remain to be found: Malinaltepec, Tecmilco, and Xocoyoltepec.

REMARKS ON TOWNS

632 [114] *Chalco* itself is the first problem, for the same name appears on a preliminary leaf which is included in the *Mendocino* copy but must have been lost from the *Matricula*. There were really four Chalcos, and the writer has chosen to identify that on page 19 of the *Matricula* with Chalco-Tlalmanalco, rather than with Chalco-Atenco. (See p. 128, where Chalco-Atenco figures in the Çitlaltepec tribute zone.)

Malinaltepec is mentioned in the chronicles of Chalco as a near-by place seized by Moteczuma II in 1508 or 1509.[4]

Tecmilco is not identifiable as a town, but I am informed by Sr. Ezequiel Linares, of Tepoztlán, Morelos, that the name lingers as that of a plain, south of Tepoztlán.

Tepuztlan also appears twice in the codices discussed. Here we probably deal with the well-known town near Cuernavaca; the homonym is dealt with under Huaxtepec (23). This decision is based in part on the existence of the place name Tecmilco south of Tepoztlán, Morelos.

Xocoyoltepec appears in the Chalcan annals as belonging especially to Axayacatl of Mexico Tenochtitlan in 1480: it was near Amaquemecan (Amecameca) and in 1606 was given to the people of San Miguel.[5]

NATURE OF THE PROVINCE

101 197 *Inhabitants and languages.*—The Chalca formed one of the traditionally Náhuatl-speaking tribes supposed to have been companions during the migration period. They were closely related to the Xochimilca, whose territory they adjoined. Until a very late period they challenged Mexican power in the Valley.

635 131 *Provincial borders in 1519.*—The province of Chalco (-Tlalmanalco) faced eastward on Tlaxcala, the great volcano forming a natural

---

[4] *Annales de ... Chimalpahin*, pp. 178 and 180.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 16 and 144.

[6] Durán, *Historia de las Indias de Nueva España* (1867–1880), I: 11: "la generacion Chalca ... se juntó con el de Xuchimilco y partió terminos con él quieta y pacíficamente: tomó por cabeçera y principal asiento á Tlalmanalco, y de allí se dividieron ... á saber: Amecamecan, Tenango con todos los Quaxuclipas, Ayotzinco, Chalco Atenco, San Martin ... lo qual es mucho menos que lo que Xuchimilco ocupó por ser mucha mas gente la de aquel tribu que la deste otro."

frontier. To the south was Huaxtepec, to the southwest Quauhnahuac, 635
and to the north the jigsaw-puzzle provinces of the heart of the Empire. 131

TRIBUTE

Tribute of the whole province.—The province of Chalco gave the 651 richest food tribute of the whole Empire:

CLOTHING

800 large mantles** [291
2 warriors' costumes with shields* 714]

FOOD*

6 wooden bins of maize
2 wooden bins of beans
2 wooden bins of chian [262]
2 wooden bins of huauhtli

22. QUAUHNAHUAC

SOURCES OF THE MAP

The fourth page of the *Matricula* shows us a series of towns headed by 635
Quauhnahuac, a name the Spaniards, in an unfortunate jest, changed 114
to Cuernavaca.[1] This province now forms the western half of the State of Morelos, with a very minor prolongation south into Guerrero. There are sixteen of these town glyphs, all of which are copied in the *Mendocino* on folio 23ʳ, with the tribute lists running over onto folio 23ᵛ. The *Mendocino* annotator seems to have made one of his rare slips, identifying one of the glyphs wrongly, as shown below. The map of this province is based on the 1910 "Carta General del Estado de [128]
Morelos" (Comisión Geográfico-Exploradora), on which the following towns have been located: 103

MENDOCINO	1910 MAP	MENDOCINO	1910 MAP
Acatlycpac, 4	Acatlipa	Quauhnahuac, 2	Cuernavaca
Amacoztitla, 14	Amacuzac	Teocalçinco, 17	Teocalzingo (Gro.)
Atlicholoayan, 9	Atlacholoaya	Xiuhtepec, 3	Xiutepec
Coatlan, 7	Coatlán del Río	Xochitepec, 6	[No change]
Chimalco, 16	Panchimalco	Xoxoutla, 15	Jojutla de Juárez
Huiçilapã, 1	Huitzilac	Yztla, 11	Puente de Ixtla
Miacatla, 5	[No change]		

Three towns remain to be located: Molotla, Ocpayucã, and Yztepec.

---

[1] Bernal Díaz (*Historia verdadera de la conquista de la Nueva España* [1904], II: 40) speaks of the "pueblo que se dize Coadlabaca [!] e comunmente corrompemos agora aquel bocablo y le llamamos Cuernavaca."

651

FOOD

[262] 4 wooden bins, 1 each of maize, beans, chian, and huauhtli*

OTHER GOODS

[323 2,000 pottery bowls**
289] 8,000 reams of native paper**

651 *Tribute of the component towns.*—Coatlan [del Río], not many
632 decades after the Spanish Conquest, gave its new masters goods which were probably similar to its former tribute. This was still paid by the old calendar system on four of the fiestas, or "cada ochenta dias," as it is expressed. They gave the following:

76 pesos of unrefined gold (*tepuzque*)
2 jars of honey
6 women's skirts
6 women's blouses

and made four "sementeras" of maize."

23. HUAXTEPEC

SOURCES OF THE MAP

635 The province of Huaxtepec, with twenty-six towns, is represented on
● 114 the fifth page of the *Matricula* and on folio 24ᵛ and 25ʳ of the *Mendocino*. The glyph in the lower right-hand corner of the *Matricula* page has been worn away, but the corresponding one in the *Mendocino* may be seen as "Huiçilan." Every town is identified in roman letters in both manuscripts, and the two versions agree except in details of spelling.
[128] This province formed the eastern part of modern Morelos State, and the present map is based on the "Carta General del Estado de Morelos," of the Comisión Geográfico-Exploradora (1910). Former and present
103 place names are compared below:

MENDOCINO	1910 MAP
Ahuehuepan	[See Remarks on Towns]
Amilçinco, 19	Amilcingo
Anenecuilco, 16	[No change]
Atlatlauca, 5	Atlatlahucan
Ayoxochapã, 24	Axochiapan
Coacalco, 4	Oacalco
Huaxtepec, 7	Oaxtepec

** PNE, 1: No. 163.

651 Atlatlauca, Totolapan, and Tlayacapan gave no tribute because they 632 were near the frontier, as mentioned above.

[727] Yacapichtla seems to have made a tribute of prisoners.

24. TLALCOÇAUHTITLAN

SOURCES OF THE MAP

635 114 Page 18 of the *Matricula* depicts three provinces, their town glyphs and tribute being ranged in vertical sections. The left-hand section, in which the cabecera is identified in roman letters, sets forth the province of Tlalcoçauhtitlan. This part of the page is copied in the *Codex Mendocino* as the top section of folio 40'. The province lay in central-eastern Guerrero and consisted of eight towns, four of which have [128] been identified—chiefly on the "Millionth Map" of the American Geographical Society (sheet "Ciudad de México"). Former and present name forms are listed below:

103

MENDOCINO	MILLIONTH MAP
Ahuaçiçinco, 4	Ahuacuotzingo
Mitzinco, 3	Mitlalcingo
Tlalcoçauhtitlã, 2	Tlalcozotitlán
Tolimani, 1	Tulimán

Four other towns remain to be located: Quauhtecomaccinco, Tepuztitlã, Ychcatlan, and Çacatla.

REMARKS ON TOWNS

632 131 *Quauhtecomaccinco,* according to one lone reference, was four leagues from Olinalá.

Tepuztitlan may be a Tepuztlan San Miguel, subject to Chiautla, from which it lay eight leagues distant.

Ychcatlan was four leagues from Tlalcoçauhtitlan "de muy mal camino de sierras" and eighteen leagues from Tlapan, being an estancia of Tenango.

"El señor natural ... fue Montezuma, al qual no tributaban, porque solo le servian en las guerras" (*PNE*, 6: 8).

The "Relación de Yecapichtla," after stating (RHE, 1: 225) that "aunque motençuma los quiso señorear no pudo vençellos y asi estuvieron siempre de por si y sobre si," admits (p. 227) that "los que de aquellos prendian los llevaban a presentar a motençuma."

PNE, 5: 210.

PNE, 5: 250.

GPM, p. 112.

GPM, p. 104.

8: Barlow E-4 (no date) 1949 NU7 Aztec NU7

651 This differs entirely from the tribute imposed by the Alcolhuaque on first conquering the province, which tribute consisted of:

323 16 pieces of colored lacquer
313 268 fine *jícaras* and *tecomates*
314 20 loads of fine cabinetmaker's wood
20 loads of copal[illegible]

25. QUIAUHTEOPAN

SOURCES OF THE MAP

635 114 On the *Matricula* page depicting three provinces (p. 18), the section extending vertically down the middle represents the province of Quiauhteopan. This section is copied in the *Codex Mendocino*, folio 40ʳ, as the middle stripe, but is placed horizontally there. Quiauhteopan Province lay in eastern Guerrero, and may have extended north into Puebla. Of its six towns, three have been identified, the "Millionth 128 Map" of the American Geographical Society, sheet "Ciudad de México," having been used as point of departure. Correspondence of old and modern names is noted below:

103

MENDOCINO	MILLIONTH MAP
Olinalan, 1	Olinalá
Qualac, 2	Cualac
Quiauhteopan (? 3)	[See Remarks on Towns]

Three other towns remain to be identified: Quauhtecomatla, Xala, and Ychcatla.

REMARKS ON TOWNS

632 *Quauhtecomatla* may be the "Tecomatlan" cited in one old document emanating from this region.[illegible] This Tecomatlan appears much later as "Joya de Tecomatlan" and is identified as a rancho seven leagues "Les Nordeste" of Chilapa, to which it was subject.[illegible]

31 *Quiauhteopan* was subject to Olinalan (Olinalá), from which it lay three leagues distant, in a direction not given.[illegible] It has been placed in 6 the otherwise blank region north of Olinalá. Quiauhteopan figures in the conquest lists along with Tlalcoçauhtitlan and Ohuapa.

[illegible] The list is quoted in n. 36 above.

[illegible] *PNE*, 5: 251.

[illegible] AGN, Padrones, 16: 108ʳ. Petatlan is given by the same source as seven leagues east of Chilapa.

[illegible] *PNE*, 5: 210.

8: Barlow E-4 (no date)1949 NU7 Aztec NU7

VI. THE OLD ACOLHUA DOMAIN: THE SOUTHEAST

THE ACOLHUAQUE conquered the lands along the southern Gulf 175 coast as well as those of the northern. Documentation is sparse but sufficient. Ixtlilxochitl names Tlatlauhquitepec and Quauhtochco, Coetlaxtlan, and Tochtepec all as conquests made by Texcoco, and each of these towns heads a page of lesser tributaries in the *Matricula*. The "Relación de Cempoalla" supports Ixtlilxochitl and also tells by what means the Mexica later acquired the Texcocan dominions.

Xoconochco, the far-flung southern province, has been added to 128 chapter vi simply because it fits no better elsewhere. It is the only province in this group of five which cannot certainly be called old Acolhua terrain.

26. Tlatlauhquitepec

SOURCES OF THE MAP

The province of Tlatlauhquitepec lay in north-central Veracruz, ex- 635 tending somewhat into northern Puebla. The *Matricula* leaf on the 114 recto side of which it is painted belongs between pages 26 and 27 of the manuscript as it exists today, but long ago it was torn out and taken to Philadelphia.[1] This detached page "26A" is copied in its proper place in the *Mendocino*, as folio 51ʳ. Of the eleven principal [28] towns of the province, nine have been located, largely on the "Millionth Map" of the American Geographical Society, sheet "Ciudad de México." Old and modern names follow: 103

MENDOCINO	MILLIONTH MAP
Atenco, 8	[See Remarks on Towns]
Ayutuchco, 5	Ayotonco
Teotlalpan, 1	Hueytlalpan
Teçiutlan, 9	Teziutlán
Tlatlauhquitepec, 7	[No change]
Xonoctla, 3	Jonotla
Yaonahuac, 6	[See Remarks on Towns]
Yayauquitlalpa, 4	Yancuitlalpan
Ytztepec, 2	[See Remarks on Towns]

Two towns remain to be found: Caltepec and Yxcoyamec.

---

[1] See Introduction, p. 7.

Provincial borders in 1519.—This was the northernmost of the three 635 provinces lying east of Tlaxcala and separating it from the sea. North 131 of it was Tuchpa; northwest, Tlapacoyan; and to the south, Quauhtochco.

Regional names.—The northern part of the province was part of the Totonacapan.

TRIBUTE

651

Tribute of the whole province.—The tribute of Tlatlauhquitepec held little variety:

CLOTHING

[291 714]

1,608 bundles[illegible] of black-and-white striped mantles**
2 warriors' costumes and shields*

OTHER GOODS

800 cakes of liquidambar**[illegible] [314]

Tribute of the component towns.—Xilotepec gave maize, chickens,$\frac{2}{A}$ 632 and liquidambar.[illegible] 651

Teotlalpan (Hueytlalpan) gave cotton mantles.[illegible]

Xoxopanco and Tzotzocolco "... antiguamente tributaban a montecuma mantas de algodón," according to the unpublished relación mentioned above.

27. QUAUHTOCHCO

SOURCES OF THE MAP

Quauhtochco was one of the provinces cutting Tlaxcala off from the 635 sea. Glyphs of its seven principal towns are painted on page 24 of the 114 *Matricula* and on folio 48ʳ of the *Mendocino*. By means of the 1908 [128] map of Veracruz,[illegible] in the center of which area this province lay, five 103 of these towns may be identified, as follows:

MENDOCINO	1908 MAP	MENDOCINO	1908 MAP
Ahuilizapan, 5	Orizaba	Tuchçonco, 3	Tozongo
Quauhtochco, 2	Huatusco	Ytzteyocan, 4	S. Nicolas
Tototlan, 1	Totutla		

Two others remain to be located: Quauhtetelco and Teuhçoltzapotlā.

[illegible] Corrected from 1,600.

[illegible] Cf. Krickeberg, *Los totonaca* (1933), pp. 111–112, for an examination of tribute from this province.

[illegible] Cf. n. 6 above.

[illegible] RHE, 1: 460: "eran basallos de moteçuma tributabanle mantas de algodon."

[illegible] Comisión Geográfico-Exploradora.

$\frac{1}{A}$[Chickens are not known to date from pre-Spanish times in the New World. In this case, the word may be a generic term for fowl.— Analyst]

651

FOOD

20 loads of cacao* [262]

OTHER GOODS

1,600 bales of cotton* [248]

Tribute of the component towns.—Ytzteyocan and Quauhtochco, 632 fifteen years after the Conquest, were paying their Spanish masters 651 what they doubtless had paid in pre-Hispanic times: cacao and cotton.*

28. CUETLAXTLAN

SOURCES OF THE MAP

Cuetlaxtlan appears on page 25 of the *Matricula* and on folio 49ʳ of the 635 *Codex Mendocino.* It was the southernmost of the provinces which 114 ● kept Tlaxcala from salt and the sea. It was in Cuetlaxtlan Province, which lay in south-central Veracruz, that Cortés landed. Of the pre-Hispanic centers, three have been located, mostly by the help of documents. The "Millionth Map" of the American Geographical Society, [128] sheet "Ciudad de México," has been used as a framework for the present map, with the results given below: 103

MENDOCINO	MILLIONTH MAP
Cuetlaxtlan, 2	Cotaxtla
Mictlanquauhtla, 3	[See Remarks on Towns]
Teoçiocan (?), 1	[See Remarks on Towns]

Three more towns remain to be located: Acozpā, Oxichan, and Tlapanicytlā.

REMARKS ON TOWNS

Cuetlaxtlan was a Mexican presidio in the final native period.* 632

Mictlanquauhtla lay half a league from the mouth of the Río Medellín, according to an unpublished land grant.* [131]

---

* According to a document published by Domínguez, *Coscomatepec de Bravo: I* (1943), p. 31.

* RHE, 1:158: "para seguridad de los forçados é quietud desta tierra se dize que tenian los señores mexicanos dos presidios e fortaleças con guarniçion e gente de guerra que heran cotastla ... y el otro hera otopa questá ocho leguas desta ciudad á la banda de norueste." This Otopa is said to have been almost deserted by the time of the sixteenth-century writer.

* Dated April 12, 1575, and preserved in the AGN, Mercedes, 10:61: "don myn enrríquez &c por la presente en nombre de su magᵈ hago mᵈ a joan sarmyento vezino de la ciudad de los angeles de un sitio de estancia para ganado menor en termynos del pº de mycthanquautla media legua poco mas o menos de la voca del rrio de medellin dentro de los medanos en un cerro."

8: Barlow E-4 (no date)1949 NU7 Aztec NU7

29. TOCHTEPEC

SOURCES OF THE MAP

Tochtepec, the rich and sprawling province which lay in north- 635
eastern Oaxaca, southern Veracruz, and Tabasco, was depicted on 114
another of the leaves which are missing from the *Matricule*. We know
that it should appear on the verso side of a leaf between pages 22 and
23 of the present manuscript, because of the arrangement of the
Mendocino copy, folio 46r. This lost page "22B" contained twenty-two [125]
principal towns, a dozen of which have been located on the base of
the American Geographical Society's "Millionth Map," sheet "Ciudad
de México." Old and modern names are compared below: 103

MENDOCINO	MILLIONTH MAP
Coçamaloapã, 12	Cosamaloapan
Chinantlan, 10	[See Remarks on Towns]
Mixtlan, 13	
Otlatitlan, 4	Otlatlán
Oxitlan, 2	Ojitlán
Puctlan (? 5)	[See Remarks on Towns]
Teotlilan, 1	Teutila
Tlacotlalpã, 6	Tlacotalpan
Tochtepec, 3	Tuxtepec
Tototepec, 9	[See Remarks on Towns]
Toztlan, 7	
Yxmatlatlan, 11	[See Remarks on Towns]

Various towns have not been located. Some of the following, when found, may provide the obscure route to the southern province of Xochonochco:

Ayotzintepec
Ayoçintepec
Cuezcomatitlã
Michapan, 14 (?)
Michtlan
Teteutlan
Tzinacanoztoc
Xayaco
Xicaltepec
Yaotlan

We may add the following town to the province: Ucila (8).

REMARKS ON TOWNS

Chinantlan has been identified with Valle Nacional. The matter is 632
discussed by Bevan. There is a curious division of evidence regarding 648
the relationship of Chinantlan to the Empire. It appears in the *Ma-*

8: Barlow E-4 (no date)1949 NU7 Aztec NU7

OTHER GOODS

651 16,000 rubber balls
[314 100 pots of liquidambar
237] 24,000 little bunches of blue, red, and green feathers
4 tufts of green feathers trimmed with yellow ones
80 handfuls of quetzal feathers

● [114] Ixtlilxochitl gives another list for the whole province: what it paid to Acolhuacan when it was first subjugated:[illegible]

CLOTHING

[291] 40 bundles of rich mantles
20 bundles of rich blouses
. . . shields, panaches, etc., of quetzal plumes

FOOD

[262] 33 loads of cacao

OTHER GOODS

[314 2,000 rubber balls
237] 400 measures of cochineal

[357] Personal services were also exacted, he relates.

651 114 The same chronicler says that twelve pueblos were subject in this province. In a little list inserted without explanation in the annals of Quauhtitlan, Tochtepec and eleven other towns of the province are named, along with these items:

[314] 20 + 10 + 1 (31) loads of cacao
400 [measures] of *achiote*
5 *centzontli* [2,000?] rubber balls[illegible]

The agreement between the Ixtlilxochitl and Quauhtitlan lists suggests that Ixtlilxochitl had the latter at his disposal.

632 651 *Tribute of the component towns.*—Even more detailed information may be secured on the tribute of Tochtepec Province.

Chinantlan and its subjects paid gold and cacao.[illegible]

Tlacotlalpan paid cotton mantles (some bearing painted pictures of

---

[illegible] Quoted in n. 36 above.

[illegible] Lehmann, *Die Geschichte der Königreiche von Colhuacan und Mexico* (1938), p. 311. The twelve towns are Quechollan, Tlacoapan, Chiltepec, Poctlan, Oxitlan, Ichcatlan, Tlequauhtla, Coyatepec, Tzinacanoztoc, Xallapan, Otlatitlan, and Tochtepec.

[illegible] *PNE*, 4: 60: "este señor ... rreconoçia a Moteçuma, y el y todos sus pueblos le tributaban oro e cacao."

the sun and the moon), cacao and parrots, ocelot skins, alligator teeth (probably for use as charms), and chalchiuites." 632 651 [23]

Toztlan also gave mantles painted with suns, as well as other garments. Dimensions are specified."

Ucila paid directly to the capital each year a gold shield, an ornament made of quetzal feathers, and two collars of gold beads, for Moctezuma and his wife. These are also depicted on the *Matricula* page. To the governor in Tochtepec they gave gold, cacao, cotton, maize, chile, beans, mantles, grass mats, and all sorts of fruit. A third tribute each year went to their own cacique."

30. XOCONOCHCO

SOURCES OF THE MAP

In the State of Chiapas, at the approaches of Guatemala, lay the coastal province of Xoconochco. The signs depicting this province are painted on the twenty-third page of the *Matricula,* and the copy appears on folio 47' of the *Codex Mendocino.* Of the eight principal towns of this province, seven have been identified, principally on the American Geographical Society's "Millionth Map," sheet "Ciudad Guatemala." Old and modern names are compared below: 635 114 ● [128] 103

MENDOCINO	MILLIONTH MAP	MENDOCINO	MILLIONTH MAP
Acapetlatlan, 2	Acapetagua	Mapachtepec, 1	Mapastepec
Ayotlan, 7	Ayutla	Maçatlan, 5	Mazatán
Huehuetlan, 4	Huehuetán	Xoconochco, 6	[See Remarks on Towns]
Huiztlan, 3	Huixtla		

One town remains to be located: Coyoacan.

"Motezuma lo señoreava: tributavanle ropa de algodon con el sol e la luna y otras pinturas pintadas en ella, y cacao y papagayos y cueros de tigre y dientes de lagartos y piedras que llaman 'chalchivtis' " (*PNE,* 5: 2).

PNE, 5: 5: "se dieron a Motezuma por amistad ... tributavanle vnas mantas de quatro piernas y de ocho baras en largo y tres palmos de ancho cada pierna, y en estas mantas pintavan en medio un çerco grande y enmedio el sol, y otra ropa blanca menuda."

PNE, 4: 47–48: "obedesçian por su Señor y Rey a Montesuma al qual tributaban y pagaban cada año por tributo vn presente en que le daban vna rodela que en su lengua llaman chimali dorada con mucho oro, y un quetzale hecho de plumeria muy rico, y un collar de cuentas de oro muy rico para el dicho Montesuma, y otro collar de la mesma suerte y manera para su muger ... cada vn año ... , y que demas desto daban otro tributo a vn Governador que el dicho Montesuma tenia puesto en vn pueblo que se dize Tustepeque ... al qual daban cantidad de oro y mucho cacao y algodon, maiz, chile, y frisoles, mantas, petates y de todos los generos de fructos que la tierra daba, demas de lo qual otro tanto tributo a un caçique que estaba por Señor en esta provincia, Señor natural della, de suerte que pagaban tres tributos en cada vn año."

VII. THE MIXTEC-ZAPOTEC ZONE

101 197 In each of the provinces of the vast zone we are about to consider, the cultural and linguistic groups known as Mixtec and Zapotec have flourished. There is some indication that in an earlier period the Mixtec extended beyond these provinces;[1] in any case, they and the Zapotec together provide a convenient denomination for the area, much of which fronted on still "unreconstructed" Mixtec city-states. Other cultures and languages there were, in bewildering abundance, within the same frontiers—Tlapanec, Mazatec, Cuicatec and so forth,—but the Mixtec and the Zapotec appear to have been the most advanced of all, and certainly were the best known to later times.

31. Tepeacac

SOURCES OF THE MAP

635 114 Tepeacac was a great bastion, which long resisted the imperialism of the Mexica and later, when the Spaniards came, proved to be the key to the eastern plateau. This cabecera, together with twenty-three principal towns, is represented on page 20 of the *Matricula*, copied on folio 42ʳ of the *Codex Mendocino*. The province extended across the center of southern Puebla. Its towns have been located principally on the [128] 1908 Puebla map of the Comisión Geográfico-Exploradora. Original name forms are compared with those of today in the following list: 103

MENDOCINO	1908 MAP
Acatzinco, 15	[No change]
Coatzinco, 9	Coatzingo
Chietlan, 5	Chietla
Epatlan, 7	[No change]
Huehuetlã, 4	Huehuetlan
Nacochtlan, 8	Necoxtla
Quatlatlauhcã, 10	Huatlatlauca
Quauhquechulan, 1	Huaquechula
Quauhtinchan, 12	Cuautinchan
Quechulac, 17	Quecholac
Tecalco, 13	Tecali
Tecamachalco	[No change]
Teonochtitlã, 2	

---

[1] E.g., east to Cozamaloapan and northwest to the skirts of Popocatepetl. Jiménez Moreno, "El enigma de los olmecas," *Cuadernos Americanos*, T. 5, Nº 5 (1942), pp. 124–125.

8: Barlow E-4 (no date)1949 NU7 Aztec NU7

32. YOALTEPEC

SOURCES OF THE MAP

The province of Yoaltepec occupies the right-hand third of page 18 635 of the *Matricula*, and the lower third of folio 40' of the *Codex Mendocino*. 114 In the original codex only the cabecera is identified by an annotation in the roman alphabet—as is often done—though in the *Mendocino* all the towns are thus identified.

This province, which contained six principal towns, lay on the northwestern border of modern Oaxaca State, and perhaps extended into Guerrero. On the basis of the "Millionth Map" of the American Geographical Society, sheet "Ciudad de México," and a considerable [128] number of documentary references, five of these six important towns, as well as a few others, have been located. The following table shows the correspondences between old and modern names:

103

MENDOCINO	MILLIONTH MAP
Ehuacalco, 4	Calihualá
Patlanalā (?), 5	[See Remarks on Towns]
Tzilacaapan, 6	Silacayoápam
Yoaltepec (? 3)	[See Remarks on Towns]
Yxicayā (?), 10	[See Remarks on Towns]

One town remains quite elusive: Ychcaatoyac.

We may add to the list given above the following towns, which were minor subjects of the province: Acatlan (2), Ayoxochiquilazala (9), Piaztla (1), Tecomaixtlahuacan (8), and Ycpatepec (?) (7).

REMARKS ON TOWNS

Acatlan recognized Moctezuma and his forebears as overlords and 632 claimed to be linked with the Mexican blood royal.[illegible] It has been placed 131 in Yoaltepec Province because it formerly had wars with Ytzucan and Tepexic,[illegible] which were within Tepeacac Province, as we see in the *Matricula*. In the mid-sixteenth century it was bordered by Izucar, Tepexic, Petlaltzinco, and Chila, and this also tends to place it in the Yoaltepec sphere.[illegible]

[illegible] *PNE*, 5: 59: "Acatlan reconocia por supremo Señor en tiempo de su gentilidad a Moteczuma y sus antepasados los Reyes de Mexico."

[illegible] *PNE*, 5: 60.

[illegible] *PNE*, 1: No. 6.

632

Piaztla gave salt and wax annually, and aided the Imperial troops 651
passing through the town by supplying them with war clubs, shields, 263
arrows, and food.[illegible] [705]
237]

Tecomaixtlahuacan was under the rein lightly. It had its own lord and none other, we are told in the sixteenth-century relación, but it chose none the less to send Moctezuma gifts now and again, and tribute is the criterion of the present map.[illegible]

Ycpatepec acquired certain articles by trade with peoples thirty leagues away and then delivered them to the Mexican tax collectors in Teutla (or Tentla). These articles were green feathers, gold, and chalchiuites.[illegible]

Yxicayan gave a combination of dwarf peppers and mantles "and nothing else."[illegible]

33. TLAPAN

SOURCES OF THE MAP

The province of Tlapan contained fourteen towns, according to the 635
glyphs of the *Matricula* (p. 17) and the *Mendocino* (fol. 39'). In the 114 ●
Matricula only "Tlauhpã" is identified in a later hand; in the *Mendo-* 131
cino, all towns are. Tlapan Province lay in the eastern extreme of modern Guerrero. Of its fourteen towns, seven have been located on the modern map. The following correspondence between ancient and
modern place names has been established, the "Millionth Map" of the [128]
American Geographical Society, sheet "Ciudad de México," having served as base.

[illegible] *PNE*, 5: 78: Piaztla was " ... sujeto al Real Imperio de Mexico y ... en su sujecion llebauan cada año cantidad de sal y sera, de que daban a los Exercitos de Mexico espedas de pedernal, rodelas y flechas y comida quando pasaban por su pueblo a la conquista de lexos [*sic*] provincias, y no le davan en señal de sujecion otro tributo alguno."

[illegible] *RMEH*, T. 2, Appendix, p. 137: "algunas veces contribuyan con algunos presentes de piedras etc. desque llaman chalchihuites á montecuma." The codex of this town (published by Schmieder) claims that the people of the town "nunca ... tributaron ni contribuyeron en cosa alguna para los dichos tributos de Mexico, y de todos eran libres y exentos" (Schmieder, *The Settlements of the Tzapotec and Mije Indians* [1930], p. 79).

[illegible] *PNE*, 4: 161: "solian ser en tiempo de su gentilidad suxetos a Munteçuma ... le davan de tributo cada tantos meses plumas verdes y oro en polvo y algunas piedras verdes de poco momento: estas cosas iban a rrescatar a otras partes fuera deste dicho pueblo, mas de treynta leguas, lo qual entregaban a los capitanes de Munteçuma que tenia puestos para el dicho efeto en Tentla" (or Teutla).

[illegible] *RMEH*, T. 2, Appendix, p. 152: "acudian con el tributo á monteçuma al cual acudian con mantas y agi y no con otra cosa."

651 632 Tlapan in the mid-sixteenth century gave 62 pesos, 3 tomines of gold quarterly, 3 loads of honey, 5 pots, and 3 loads of wax in pellets.[77]

[316 263 237] [446 [illegible]] Tototepec, likewise about a generation after the Conquest, gave 50 measures of gold dust and certain articles of clothing quarterly, and daily gave the services of seven Indians, and a chicken to the Calpixque.[78] 1/A

34. TLACHQUIAUCO

SOURCES OF THE MAP

635 114 ● The province of Tlachquiauco was not large. It contained three principal towns, according to folio 45ʳ of the *Mendocino Codex*, the folio copied from the recto side of a lost leaf (page "22A") which followed Coyolapan and preceded Xoconochco in the original manuscript. Of the three towns of Tlachquiauco Province, one has not [28] been located, but the other two (lying in northwestern Oaxaca) have been identified as follows on the "Millionth Map" of the American Geographical Society, sheet "Ciudad de México":

[103]

MENDOCINO	MILLIONTH MAP
Achiotlan, 4	S. Miguel Achiutla
Tlachquiauco, 3	Tlaxiaco

The town which has eluded identification is Çapotlan.

Mixtepec (2) and Tlacotepec (1) are added from other sources.

REMARKS ON TOWNS

632 *Mixtepec* was subject to Tlachquiauco in the days when the latter still held out against the Mexica, and presumably fell with it.[79]

Tlacotepec appears in some of the younger Moctezuma's conquests jointly with Ycpatepec (in the province of Yoaltepec).

Tlachquiauco is a name which has suffered considerable corruption, but there is no novelty in the identification of the town.

Çapotlan appears vaguely linked with Etla and Macuilxochic in one source.[80]

---

[77] *PNE*, 1: No. 725: "dan cada ochenta dias sesenta y dos pesos y tres tomines de oro en poluo y tres cargas de miel y çinco xarros y tres cargas de çera en pellas." The statement also includes similar data from near-by towns.

[78] *PNE*, 1: No. 28: "dan cada ochenta dias çinquenta pesos de oro en poluo y çinco naguas y ocho mantillas, y cinco mantas grandes; mas dan siete yndias de seruicio cada dia y una gallina al Calpixque."

[79] *PNE*, 4: 142: "el caçique de tlaxiaco que era a quien estos de mistepeque reconocian por señor tenia guerra con montecuma."

[80] *ENE*, 16: 68.

1/A [i.e. A civil functionary in whose care the public stores were entrusted. – Analyst]

NATURE OF THE PROVINCE

Inhabitants and languages.—This province seems to have been formed 635
out of a vanquished Mixtec city-state, at a very late period indeed in 648
the Empire's history. It is listed as one of three principal pre-Hispanic powers of the region in the "Relación de Teoçapotlan,"[18] though we know that it lost its independence in 1511 or 1512.[19]

Provincial borders in 1519.—To the south lay sister Mixtec states 635
such as Puctla and Zacatepec, which defied the Mexicans successfully, 131
to the east and north the Empire province of Coayxtlahuacan, and to the west that of Yoaltepec. 635

Regional names.—Tlachquiauco lay in what is commonly called the Mistecapan.

TRIBUTE

The only data available on the tribute of Tlachquiauco Province 651
comes from the *Codex Mendocino:*

CLOTHING

400 large mantles** [291
1 warrior's costume and shield* 714]

OTHER GOODS*

20 vessels of gold dust [316
5 sacks of cochineal
400 bunches of quetzal feathers 237]

35. COAYXTLAHUACAN

SOURCES OF THE MAP

The province of Coayxtlahuacan appears on page 21 of the *Matricula* 635
and is copied on folio 43' of the *Codex Mendocino*. It contained eleven [131]
principal towns,[20] all of which have been found. They lay in northern 114
Oaxaca. In the *Matricula* the towns of "Cohuaxtlauacā," "Tamaçolapan," and "Tepozcololan" are identified in the roman alphabet; and

---

[18] *PNE*, 4: 193: "dizen los yndios que poco antes que los españoles viniesen solos auian los de Tututepec que estos eran guerreros por si, y los de Tlachiaco que tambien eran guerreros por si, y Motecçuma que era el Señor de México."

[19] Anderson and Barlow, "The Maize Tribute of Moctezuma's Empire," *Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden* (1943), 30: 414–415.

[20] Cortés (*Cartas y relaciones* [1866], pp. 152–153) speaks of twelve towns in the province of "Coastoaca."

635 114 in the same codex the right-hand margin is so badly worn that the glyphs of Tamaçolan and Mitla are no longer visible. These are preserved in the *Mendocino* copy, however. The present map is based [128] chiefly upon the "Millionth Map" of the American Geographical Society, sheet "Ciudad de México." Correspondences between former and modern names are given below:

103

MENDOCINO	MILLIONTH MAP
Coaxomulco, 11	Cuasimulco
Coayxtlahuacã, 6	Coixtlahuaca
Cuicatlan, 7	Cuicatlán
Mictlan, 18	Mitlatongo
Nochiztlan, 15	Nochixtlán
Tamaçolan, 19	Tamazola
Tamaçulapã, 4	Tamazulápam
Tepuzcululã, 13	Teposcolula
Texopan, 5	Tejúpam
Xaltepec, 17	[See Remarks on Towns]
Yancuitlan, 14	[See Remarks on Towns]
Çoçolan, 16	[See Remarks on Towns]

We may expand this list with the following towns, known from other sources to have been subject:

Atlatlaucca, 12
Chila, 2
Icxitlan, 3
Malinaltepec, 10
Papaloticpac, 8
Petlaltzinco, 1
Tepeucila, 9

REMARKS ON TOWNS

632 *Atlatlaucca* was visited by tax collectors from Coayxtlahuacan.[illegible] It may be found in the Oaxaca map of the atlas of the Secretaría de Agricultura y Fomento.

[712] *Coayxtlahuacan* was a celebrated Mixtec stronghold, the downfall of which was one of the great events of the fifteenth century. The Mexicans made it a garrison and center for tribute collection.[illegible]

Chila (2) admitted being subject to the Empire; the town denied

---

[illegible] *PNE,* 4: 165: "estos dos pueblos de Atlatlaucca y Malinaltepeque reconoçian por Rey a Munteçuma ... dos yndios ... que se llamaban 'calpisques' ... hacian rrecoxer [el tributo] y lo lleuauan a la prouinçia de Cuestlauaca, donde el dicho Munteçuma tenia puesta su frontera de gente de guerra."

[illegible] *PNE,* 4: 165, for example, speaks of "Cuestlauaca, donde el dicho Munteçuma tenia puesto su frontera de gente de guerra." See also Papaloticpac, below. When the invading army of Cortés reached Izucar de Matamoros, Coayxtlahuacan threw off the Mexican yoke and surrendered to the Spaniards. (Cortés, *Cartas y relaciones* [1866], pp. 152–153).

632
651 Petlaltzinco was obliged to feed Empire troops when they passed through the town.[illegible]

Tepeucila contributed mantles and tiger skins bought from their neighbors, and a few feathers.[illegible]

Texopan gathered these items for the tribute: parrot feathers, slaves, and small amounts of cochineal.[illegible]

Çoçolan was a gold-producing region which caught the eye of Cortés very quickly—doubtless because of the display of tributes in the capital.[illegible]

36. Coyolapan

SOURCES OF THE MAP

635
114 Coyolapan was a huge province, the heart of the State of Oaxaca. The principal native towns numbered eleven, nine of which have been located. They are depicted on page 22 of the *Matricula* and in the *Mendocino* copy on folio 44ʹ. The cabecera and one other town are identified in roman letters in the *Matricula*. The modern map which [28] has served to reconstruct the province is the American Geographical Society's "Millionth Map," sheet "Ciudad de México." Correspondences between former and modern names follow:

103

MENDOCINO	MILLIONTH MAP
Camotlan, 3	Camotlán
Coyolapan, 21	Cuilapam
Etlan, 9	Etla
Guaxacac, 19	Oaxaca de Juárez
Macuilxochic, 22	Macuilzóchitl
Octlan, 29	Ocotlán
Quauxilotitlan, 10	[See Remarks on Towns]
Teticpac~~, 26~~	Teſtipac (San Sebastian)
Tlalcuechahuayã, 24	[See Remarks on Towns]

Two towns represented on the *Matricula* page remain to be located: Quatzontepec and Teocuitlatlan.

[illegible] *PNE*, 6: 70: "... era subjecto al Ymperio mexicano, y no dauan ningun tributo mas de que eran obligados a dar a los exerxitos de Mexico que por el dicho pueblo de Petlaltzinco passauan bastimentos."

[illegible] *PNE*, 4: 95: "... los sujeto Montecuma y le sirvieron tributandole mantas y cueros de tigres que compravan de los pueblos comarcanos y algunas plumas."

[illegible] *PNE*, 4: 55: "... estaban subjetos a su rrey Moteçuma ... daban de tributo a su rrey Moteçuma esclavos, plumas de papagayos y grana en poca cantidad."

[illegible] Cortés, *Cartas y relaciones* (1866), p. 152: "envié á buscar oro á la provincia de [illegible]."

651

CLOTHING

80 Huaztec warriors' costumes, together with shields[6] [291
800 bundles of wide mantles (quarterly) 714]

FOOD (quarterly)

40 baskets of cacao ground with maize [262]
40 baskets of chian pinolli

OTHER TRIBUTE

Perpetual repair of the *teocalli* of Huitznahuac[7] [358]

38. PETLACALCO

SOURCES OF THE MAP

On the verso side of the American Philosophical Society leaf (2A) of 635 the *Matricula* and on folio 20r and 20v of the *Codex Mendocino* the 114 tributary province of Petlacalco is represented. Just as Çitlaltepec 131 and Tlatelolco included the northern lakes, so this province included the Lake of Chalco and its southern shore—the Pedregal. The tribute-gathering center lay in the zone of once powerful Azcapotzalco. On [128] the 1:100,000 map "Valle de México" of the Secretaría de Agricultura 103 y Fomento (1937) we find a number of the towns of this province:

MENDOCINO	1937 MAP
Auchpanco	Ayapango
Cocotlan, 15	[No change]
Colhuacacinco	[See Remarks on Towns]
Cuitlahuac, 11	Tlahuac
Huiçilopochco, 9	Churubusco
Mizquic, 14	[No change]
Olac, 12	[See Remarks on Towns]
Petlacalcatl, 8	[See Remarks on Towns]
Tecalco	[No change]
Tecoloapan, 7	
Tepopulan, 16	[No change]
Tencacoac	[See Remarks on Towns]
Tzapotitlan, 10	Zapotitlan
Xico, 13	[No change]

The list of missing towns, however, is extensive:

Acapan
Nextitlan
Tepechpan
Tequemecan

Tlaçoxiuhco
Toyac
Xaxalpan
Yopico

---

[7] San Juan Huitznahuac, jurisdiction of Azcapotzalco, D.F. (?).

REMARKS ON TOWNS

632 An extensive zone to the south of Lake Chalco is rendered uninhabit-
[133 able by the lava flow, or "Pedregal," emitted by the Ajusco Mountains,
311] which form the valley rim. If any small settlements existed in this area,
their tribute was probably reckoned as a part of that collected from
some major town in the region of Xochimilco or Tepoztlan.

Auchpanco is identified by Acosta with Ayapango.

Colhuacacinco,[8] later San Cristobal, lay on the shore of Lake Xaltocan, east of Tzonpanco (2).

Olac is a barrio of Xochimilco.[9]

632 *Petlacalcatl* is the inscription under the glyph of a house made of
114 grass mats, in the *Mendocino*. It occupies the usual place of the cabecera in the manuscript, and like all the other towns was originally followed by the word "pu[ebl]o." A later hand has struck this out and has replaced it with the word "gobernador," perhaps under the influence of the double (and doubtful) annotation about "Acolhuacā" and "Acolmecatl calpixqui" (tribute collector) which heads Acolhuacan Province.

That something is wrong is evident from the form of the original annotation. It is probably a place glyph, but the annotation takes the form of a personal glyph. I have chosen to read it as Petlacal*co*. The result is the same, for the Petlacalcatl, on the facing *Mendocino* page, was a head tribute collector, and the Petlacalco[10] was the "audiencia" building in the Tenochtitlan palace, which also housed a majordomo in charge of the granaries.[11]

632 *Texcacoac*[12] is a barrio of Tepotzotlan, and consequently we should judge that it lay north of Tecoloapan (7).

---

[8] Located after the printing of the map, "dista del pueblo de Tiçayuca vna legua hazia el sueste" (*PNE*, 3: 44 and n. 2).

[9] Olaguíbel, *Onomatología del estado de México* (1894), p. 96.

[10] Sahagún, *Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España* [1938], I: 166.

[11] *Ibid.*, II: 311.

[12] Located after the printing of the map; it is mentioned in the Ayer "Fragment of a Village Book," and, as Texcacoa, in García Cubas' *Diccionario*.

121 included the problems which this study addresses: it begins with the principles which governed the social life of the Tenochca community in its historical context without discussing if this was the result of divergent, convergent or internal evolution, or of degeneration, or of acculturation, etc.

The problems treated here can be traced in the following terms:

a) To elucidate if there were clans among the inhabitants of Mexico Tenochtitlan just before the arrival of the Spanish, and if in the affirmative, what type they were.

b) To elucidate if at this time there existed any deep social stratification among them and what were its characteristics. /p. 11/

c) To elucidate if, about the time of the arrival of the Spanish, their social relations were molded by one or other of these previously mentioned factors, or by neither of them (5).

114 Regarding these problems, the opinions of investigators—although they may not have outlined them exactily in the same terms—have been divided into two camps which make completely different affirmations and neither of which by itself explains the characteristics which we know the Tenochcas had. Some authors—among whom are those who actually initiated the discussion of this subject—like Bandelier (6) and Lehman (7), considered essentially that, in the period to which we refer, the Tenochcas "still" had a gentile organization, putting a great stress on the existence of the calpullis which they considered equalitarian exogamous clans. Other authors such as Moreno (8), Caso, (9), Kroeber (10), White (11), Toscano (12), etc.,

---

5. To elucidate the type of government—as a manifestation and proof of the existence of a determined type of society among the Tenochcas—is undoubtedly a problem which can be resolved on its own after knowing the basic social organization. It is not attempted in this study except in so far as it helps resolve the other problems.

6. Bandelier, 1878, 1, 11.

7. Lehman, W., 1909, p. 107, 108.

8. Moreno, Manuel M., 1931, p. 14 ff.

9. Caso, Alfonso, 1942, p. 156; 1946, various lectures.

10. Kroeber, A. L., 1923, p. 359.

11. White, L., 1940, p. 33.

12. Toscano, S., 1946, p. 779.

are opposed to discerning such features in the Tenochca society and have tried, in special studies or in a few lines, to demonstrate the falseness of this point of view, maintaining that the Tenochcas of this period no longer had a gentile society, placing great emphasis on the existence of their social classes, their organized commerce, their wars of conquest, etc., and consider that the calpulli was simply a territorial division or whatever, but not a clan.

These two positions in a certain way complement each other, but really exclude each other in the form in which they have been presented, it not being possible simply to bring them together in order to have an idea of what was going on in the Valley of Mexico up to the time of the arrival of the Spanish—as some other authors have done, who actually sustain a third position, such as Vaillant (13),

13. Vaillant, G.C., 1941, p. 108 ff.

Thompson (14), Murdock (15), and in a certain respect, Acosta (16),

14. Thompson, J.E., 1933, pp. 105, 119.

15. Murdock, G.P., 1934, pp. 372, 373.

16. Acosta Saignes, M., 1945, p. 21.

who present /p. 12/ the Tenochca society as having, at one and the same time, exogamous clans and marked social classes both with equal or very similar importance, or with exogamous clans in transition through internal evolution to a society with social classes.

Most remarkable is that all these investigators have arrived at such different conclusions working approximately with the same facts and consulting the same sources. So much so that one of them, Bandelier, the leader of those who hold that the Tenochcas had exogamous clans, during a long period held the opposite point of view (17) and only after many arduous discussions with Morgan came to change his stand, contributing, nevertheless, a great number of arguments for both positions.

In order to understand this situation it is necessary to follow, at least in a general fashion, the process of the discussion which at first sight appears to revolve about the use of certain terms. The discussion was initiated by Bandelier (18), but actually it was not he who outlines the problem of elucidating the bases of the social organization of the Tenochcas, but rather Morgan, and it is to him that we have to go in order to understand the origin and the development of all these positions. Morgan, among other things of various value, made the discovery that social forms could be ordered in an evolutionary line, and that in doing this, one could see a correlation between the characteristics of inventions and discoveries and human institutions; there appearing in the course of human history two successive plans of organization: one based on the personal relations of kinship ("societas") and the other based on territory and property (19) ("civitas").

Although even before Morgan's work there was talk of the difference between bonds originating in kinship and those originating in territorial situation (20), actually it was Morgan who gave meaning to this distinction, making evident the great difference between

---

17. Bandelier, in White, L., 1940, 1, Introduction.

18. From a scientific point of view there is no need to take into account the feudalistic conception of the conquerors, although we have necessarily to avail ourselves of their data.

19. Morgan, L.H., 1877, p. 54, etc.

20. Maine, 1861, cited by Lowie, R.H., 1937.

114 communities based on kinship through common descent and communities based on territorial division and land ownership; as well as the different position on the scale of human evolution which one or other base will bring about. Morgan proposed an evolutionary scheme of all human societies including in it societies with matrilineal exogamous customs /p. 13/ as a first evolutionary stage, societies with patrilineal exogamous customs as a later evolutionary stage, societies clearly based on the ownership of land and on territorial division as a stage even higher, and societies which he considered to be in transition between these steps of a unilinear evolution (21). Although Morgan was not the first person to speak of societies with exogamous customs, since they were already known from an earlier date (22), it was Morgan who was first to attempt to systematize them as special forms of social organization based on kinship through common descent, and to give an explanation of their origin and of their evolution from a society based on the systematization of sexual relationships up until the society based on ownership of land and territorial distribution appears, at the same time trying to demonstrate that there is an intimate relationship between the various aspects of culture which each evolutionary period evinced. At the same time Morgan affirmed that humanity shunned incest and that for that reason one could not expect to find groups with endogamous customs (as some authors thought (23)) which according to his theory had disappeared quite at the beginning of social evolution.

Morgan's well-ordered scheme with two fundamental types of human societies, one based on kinship through common descent ("societas") with matrilineal or patrilineal clans, the other based on territorial division and on the ownership of land ("civitas"), was widely accepted by many investigators since actually it introduced for the first time the

21. Morgan, L. H., 451, 452, 333, 334, etc.

22. Latham, 1859; Bachofen, 1861, cited by Engels, 1891, and by Lowie, 1937.

23. MacLennen, 1886, cited by Engels, 1891, and by Lowie, 1937; Lubbock, 1884, pp. 93, 135 ff.; Giraud Telon, 1874, cited by Engels, 1891.

systematization of very extensive data whose evolutionary significance nobody had attempted to see as a whole. It was a scheme that was taken almost without modifications by some investigators, which is precisely what happened with those who studied the society of the Tenochcas, resulting that while some maintained that it was a community of the "societas" type, that is, that it was based on kinship through common descent (24), other authors maintained that it was a community of the "civitas" type, (25) that is, based on territory and property (26), or that it was in transition between the two extremes (27), according to the emphasis which they saw in the data and which convinced them in one or the other of these two directions.

/p. 14/ In fact the discovery that social forms could be ordered in an evolutionary sense can be considered as a definite advance in the social sciences, accepted by the majority of schools although conceived in a way which differs from the typically Morganist (28). The same can be said of the existence of two fundamentally different types of societies (29). But it must be accepted that some of Morgan's affirmations—which were made with relatively meagre data and in a first attempt to embrace all knowledge about human societies—have been, in the course of new studies, considered inexact, as surely they

---

24. Bandelier, 1878, p. 599 ff.; Lehmann, 1909, etc.

25. Moreno, M., 1931, p. 16, 82, etc.

26. White, L., 1940, p. 33, 35, etc.

27. Acosta Saignes, M., 1945, p. 21.

28. Lowie, R. H., 1946, p. 240; Schmidt, W., 1939, pp. 11, 12; McIver, 1937, p. 485, etc.

29. Kirchhoff, P., 1944, p. 1; Radin, P., 1931, p. 1, etc.

are, and that there are new theoretical acquisitions and new discoveries which surely ought to be taken into account in order to understand the basic social organization which the Tenochcas had at the time of the arrival of the Spanish.

Perhaps among the more important modifications to Morgan's work is the acceptance that the scheme of unilinear evolution of human society—which had been rejected from the beginning by investigations in this field (30)—is certainly outmoded now (31), and we should think of the possibility of evolutionary radiation, of internal evolution, acculturation, degeneration, etc., in order to establish a correct scheme (31a).

Another of the important additions to Morgan's work is that of Engels who, accepting Morgan's scheme, stressed that in reality the differences between the types of communities "societas" and "civitas" were based rather upon the fact that the first had their basis in the systematization of sexual production, that is, in reproduction ("gentiles"), while the second were based in the production of objects, which is to say, economic production ("políticas") (32). This is a very important addition, although this author and those that followed him in his ideas also accepted the Morganist idea that societies based on kinship could only be unilateral and exogamous, and that, in general terms, social evolution was unilinear. Some authors

---

30. Maine, 1861, loc. cit.

31. Schmidt, W., 1939, p. 11; McIver, 1937, p. 485; Lowie, R. H., 1937, p. 59; Kirchhoff, P., 1941, p. 1, etc.

31a. Sorokin makes a good criticism of the classical evolutionary theories, in: Dinamique Socio-culturelle et Evolutionisme; in: Sociologie au XXme siècle, Paris, 1947.

32. Engels, F., 1891, pp. 5, 6.

114 criticized Engels' manner of viewing social evolution and his introducing phenomena of sexual relationship as the basis for one type of society; they made /p. 15/ systematicizations of the social organization of humanity considering that everything could be explained through economic production (32a). But it appears that this is a theoretical regression surpassed by Engels himself (33) upon dealing with societies relatively or really primitive.

Another important modification to Morgan's work deals with the fact that the most primitive societies, still extant in the modern era, present a more simple organization than the clan organization, with extended families /macro-familias/, frequently with monogamy without traces of promiscuity or group-marriage (34). Relative to this, Morgan's assertion that the Kamilaroi and the Hawaiians (and groups like these) represent the same social situation, and the most ancient form of organization (35), could not be considered acceptable, groups having been encountered surely more primitive, and with great differences among these.

32a. Cunow, 1926.

33. Before Engels and other investigators of his mind accepted the systematization proposed by Morgan, Karl Marx had proposed a systematization of human societies into four types: Asiatic, Ancient, Feudal and Modern, basing his opinion principally on the characteristics of economic production (Marx, K., 1859, p. 11). From this point of view Marx studied Modern Society (the capitalistic one) thoroughly, and recently Wittfogel has done the same regarding Asiatic Society, which he prefers to call Oriental (Wittfogel, K. A., 1928).

34. Krause, F., 1932, p. 182; Schmidt, W., 1922, p. 142 ff.

35. Lowie, R. H., 1937, p. 75.

In addition the supposed evolution from matrilineal clans to patrilineal could not be proved, since appearing as distinct complexes, although related, in concrete cases it was evident that they could not be successive (36). Furthermore it was seen that some of the groups which Morgan considered in transition from matrilineal customs to patrilineal customs and others with matrilineal customs, exhibited in many aspects a notable superiority relative to those who had patrilineal customs (and towards which the former would be evolving); which was inexplicable in its systematic appearance, if one accepted the succession from matrilineal clans to patrilineal as a requisite step of general evolution (37).

With respect to the modifications to Morgan's ideas about the types of clans, there is a very complex situation. For the reasons given, the majority of the investigators connected intimately with ethnography among tribes of primitive culture abandoned Morgan's ideas almost in their entirety, and accepted explicitly only his systematization of kinship terminology. Nevertheless, they are possibly under the /p. 16/ influence of Morgan, in accepting the distinction between a type of society based on kinship through common descent and another based on ownership of land and territorial distribution. And above all it is certain that they are under the influence of Morgan in accepting, in general terms, that the only organisms possible with a base in kinship through common descent must be unilateral, an idea which is very common among anthropologists (38), although even before Morgan's work one spoke of endogamous groups (see footnote 23 of this chapter) which had many similarities with clans and which appear to be based on kinship but are not exogamous. Nevertheless,

---

36. Lowie, R. H., 1937, p. 78.

37. Krause, R., 1932, p. 196; McIver, 1937, p. 486; Kirchhoff, P., 1944, pp. 8, 9.

38. Goldenweiser, 1937, p. 304; Lowie, R. H., 1934, p. 254; Kroeber, A. L., 1923, pp. 357, 358; White, L., 1940, p. 29; etc.

114 in this respect there is a study which makes a contribution of great importance to the ideas of Morgan and which can be accepted without abandoning an evolutionary stand and accepting that the bases of social organization are sexual production and economic production in the various stages of history. This is the discovery of P. Kirchhoff that there have been no strictly endogamous groups as these authors thought (39), but that on the other hand there indeed are groups based on kinship through common descent, which, contrariwise to what Morgan thought, are neither unilateral nor exogamous, but are ambilateral and have an endogamous tendency (40). The clan, according to these ideas is essentially an organism based on kinship through common descent, and not on unilaterality and exogamy. The clan can be defined thus as: (1) a group of persons, (2) organized in a permanent form, (3) to which one belongs through real or supposed descent and exceptionally through adoption, (4) which regulates marriage relationships and—the author would add—(5) which determines other social relationships wherever present. In accord with point (3) of this definition one can classify clans into two types: unilateral, if the members of the group trace their kinship by common descent only through the father (patrilineal) or only through the mother (matrilineal); and ambilateral if the members of the group trace the closeness of their kinship to their antecedents through individuals of either sex. With point (4) of the definition of a clan, clans can be classified as exogamous, if the prohibition of contracting marriage among themselves exists for the members of the clan, and /p. 17/ non-exogamous or with an endogamous tendency if there is the tendency to contract marriages within the same clan. These latter could be called endogamous if they evinced a strict endogamy such as the exogamy of the exogamous type clans—but the presence only of an

---

39. Besides the authors cited in footnote 23, Watterman (1917, p. 273) thinks of the possibility of the Tenochca calpulli's being an endogamous clan, without this signifying a very special structure; and Linton (1943, pp. 238, 239) speaks also of exogamous and endogamous clans, the latter with interest in property and privilege.

40. Kirchhoff, P., 1944, p. 6, 8, ff.

endogamous tendency has made the author of this classification (Kirchhoff, P.) prefer this denomination. It has been found that the clans called unilateral in general are exogamous, and that in turn, the ambilateral clans are non-exogamous, so that the terms can be used almost interchangeably. Moreover, exogamous clans occur in fairly equalitarian societies, like that of the Iroquois, while clans with an endogamous tendency present a marked social stratification, which stems from the formative principle of a clan of this type; the proximity of each member of the clan to the common ancestor, which results in a gamut of ranks within each clan, and even within the context of the tribe where the situation is reproduced. Then again Kirchhoff gives the name of clans also to non-exogamous and ambilateral groups—although the term does not have this generalized use—for very possibly the groups which gave the name of clan to social organisms based on kinship through common descent—as also those which are called sibs or *Sippe*—were, paradoxically, ambilateral and had an endogamous tendency. In accord with point (5) of the definition of clan, we could say only that if the groups of relatives through common descent are of importance in a community, we should speak of clans, and if not, then of their remains, of their vestiges, etc.

Also with respect to the characteristics which social strata show there have been some modifications of importance, which do not contradict the basic position of Morgan and Engels about the existence of social evolution and about the consanguineal or economic bases of social organization. They are additions which were not taken into account upon undertaking other studies about the social organization of the Tenochcas. Principally they consist of the delimitation of three phenomena: social class, rank [*estamento*] and caste. In some societies with a certain social evolution, ranks [*estamentos* hereafter "ranks". Translator.] are present, which are social strata composed of persons of a community with a similar social and economic position who are not related to each other, but who belong to their stratum through inheritance, and because of which these societies show little interrank [*interestamental*] mobility (41). In other very advanced societies the social strata are veritable social classes: oppositional

---

41. Mombert, P., 1944.

114 strata of a community whose social role is determined by /p. 18/ the possession of basically different, but complementary means of production, such as land, tools or simply personal working capacity (42),

42. Marx, K., 1909, p. 1034.

and in which there is great interclass mobility (43). There are other

43. Mombert, P., 1944.

121 societies which evince castes. As we lack a definition of caste in terms of kinship and economy (since they are at times considered like clans but tentatively endogamous (44), it is proposed here, also

44. Forde, D., 1934, p. 273; Kroeber, A.L., 1944.

tentatively, to put forward such a definition; a caste being (1) a subdivision of a society, (2) with a strong endogamous tendency (3) to which one belongs by birth, (4) which automatically determines the rank of all the members of the society, and (5) which determines every individual's role in the social division of labor (45).

45. This is a definition tentatively arrived at through conversations with Dr. P. Kirchhoff.

In this work it has been the author's intention only to elucidate whether the social organization of the Tenochcas was rooted in phenomena of kinship through common descent, in light of earlier theoretical attainments, in order to attempt to explain its function and its place within the undeniable social evolution of humanity. Outside of this work has remained the discussion of social relations rising directly from economic production, as are commerce (46), slavery (47), and

46. In this respect there is a most interesting work of Acosta Saignes, The Pochtecas [Los Pocheteca], (1945), and his thesis on the same subject.

47. See the work of Bosch, Carbs: Prehispanic Slavery among the Aztecs [La Esclavitud Prehispánica entre los Aztecas] (1945).

127 174 arrived at the town called Tula, quite diminished in numbers on account of the divisions that had taken place. There they remained some time, replenishing their provisions and increasing their number, living in a cerro called Cohuatepec, that is to say, the snake-mountain. Here, in dreams, their idol ordered his priests to deflect the water of a very full river that flowed through that region so that it might spread over the whole valley and then be brought to the middle of the mountain on which they were living, for he wished to show them the appearance of the land he had promised them. They constructed the dyke and the water spread out and extended over the whole valley, turning it into a very beautiful lagoon lined with willows, poplars, and sabines. In the lagoon grew many rushes and reeds, and on that account the place was called Tula, meaning the-place-of-the-rushes (*junca*) or reeds (*espadaña*).

"The place soon abounded in fish and waterfowl, such as ducks, herons, *gallareta* [coots], with which, together with many other species of birds, the entire lagoon seemed to be completely covered. And to the present day the lagoon of Mexico abounds in these animals.[5] The place was thickly covered with rushes (*carrizales*) and marine flowers, and inhabited by differently colored thrushes, some red, others yellow, which were accustomed to gather at the place and which harmonized with the songbirds in the trees, of which there were quite a number; all this making the place delightful and pleasant, and as such it was painted in their books.

"The Mexicans, quite oblivious to what their idol had told them, namely that this place was merely an imitation and pattern of the land they were to be given, stayed in this delightful place (a long time) and began to feel that it was quite satisfactory, some even saying that they desired to stay there permanently, and that this was really the place selected by their god Huitzilopochtli; that it was from that place that they were to follow their desires, being the rulers of the four parts of the world, etc.

"Their idol, seeing this, waxed so angry that he said to the priests, 'Who are these who thus wish to transgress and put obstacles in the way of my orders and commands? Are they perhaps greater than my-

---

114 [5] The *Crónica Mexicana* of Alvarado Tezozomoc (1598), another of this group of closely similar histories, is more explicit about these animals, listing frogs, *axolotl*, *camarón*, *axayácatl*, *izcauitli* and *tecuitlatl*, and adds that the Mexicans regarded the red *izcauitli* (identified above as Ephydridae, but possibly Chironomidae in this context) as the body and blood of the war god Huitzilopochtli (Orozco y Berra's edition, 1878, p. 228). A more probable explanation of the attribution of red color to *izcauitli* is that some one, not necessarily Tezozomoc, confused the Nahuatl words *iztatl*, salt, and *eztli*, blood.

648 reputation for valour before, (for they had heard of the wars at Potonchan and Tabasco, of Cingapacinga and Tlaxcala, and they called us Teules, which is to call us gods or evil things), from now on they took us for sorcerers, and said that no evil that was planned against us could be so hidden from us that it did not come to our knowledge, and on this account they showed us good will.

346 782 246 I think that the curious reader must be already satiated hearing this story about Cholula and I wish that I had finished writing about it, but I cannot avoid calling to mind the prisons of thick wooden beams which we found in the city, which were full of Indians and boys being fattened so that they could be sacrificed and their flesh eaten. We broke open all these prisons, and Cortés ordered all the Indian prisoners that were confined within them to return to their native countries, and with threats he ordered the Caciques and captains and priests of the city not to imprison any more Indians in that way, and not to eat human flesh. They promised not to do so, but what use were such promises? as they never kept them.

787 [114] Let us anticipate and say that these were the great cruelties that the Bishop of Chiapas, Fray Bartolomé de las Casas, wrote about and never ceased talking about, asserting that for no reason whatever, or only for our pastime and because we wanted to, we inflicted that punishment, and he even says it so artfully in his book that he would make those believe, who neither saw it themselves, nor know about it, that these and other cruelties about which he writes were true (as he states them) while it is altogether the reverse of true.[1]. It did not happen as he describes it. Let the monks of the order of Santo Domingo see what they can read in the book in which he has written it, and

---

[1] Blotted out in the original: "I beg your Lordship's pardon for stating it so clearly."—G. G.

14:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

ON THE

ART OF WAR AND MODE OF WARFARE

OF THE

ANCIENT MEXICANS.

By AD. F. BANDELIER.

---

114 Not only the history of Ancient Mexico, but the true condition and degree of culture of its aboriginal inhabitants, are yet but imperfectly known. Nearly all architectural remains have disappeared; the descendants of the former aborigines have modified their plan of life, and we are almost exclusively reduced, for our knowledge of Mexican antiquities, to the printed and written testimony of those who saw Indian society at Mexico either at the time of, or not too long after, its downfall. But these authors, whether eye-witnesses of the conquest, like Cortés, Bernal Diez del Castillo, Andres de Tapia, and others; or missionaries sent to New Spain at an early date,—as Toribio of Benavent (Motolinia), Sahagun or (towards the close of the 16th, or beginning of the 17th century) Acosta, Davila, Mendieta, and Torquemada,—they are sometimes, on many questions, in direct opposition to each other. Thus the uncertainty is still increased, and the most difficult critical labor heaped upon the student. Furthermore, to magnify the task, we are placed in presence of several Indian writers of the 16th and 17th centuries (like Duran, Tezozomoc, and Ixtlilxochitl), who disagree with each other on the most important questions, quite as much as the Spanish authors themselves.

114 121 It may appear presumptuous, while knowing of the existence of such difficulties, to attempt the description of even a single feature of life of Mexico's former Indian Society. Still, while engaged upon translating the Mexican chronicle of Fernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc into the English language, I was so struck by the picture which, unintentionally perhaps, that author exhibits of the condition and organization of the Mexican tribe, that I could not refrain from investigating more closely several features

114 of that organization. The condition of Mexican society, which 121 is commonly given as subject to a monarchical, nay, even to a despotic rule, appears from the relation of Tezozomoc as one of a military, or rather warlike community. Every feature of their military action is intimately connected with their *civil life*. I could not resist the temptation, therefore, to make the military institutions of the Mexicans, their mode of warfare, the subject of special investigation, trusting that the results of this investigation, however defective, would not be utterly useless in promoting our knowledge of the true condition of ancient aboriginal society on this continent.

105 The Mexicans proper,[1] better known as the "Aztecs" of Mexico, belonged to the highest order of sedentary or "Village" Indians. Still, *warfare*, and *not agriculture*, appears to have been their chief occupation. They were essentially a tribe of *warriors*, who, as long as they were weak and hemmed in by foes, subsisted on fish, birds, and aquatic plants,[2] while, as soon as successful sallies from the lake-centre began to extend their sway and power, the Mexicans commenced also to live, in a great measure, upon the produce and industrial resources of *subjected* tribes. During their migration, from a region lying north of the present state of Durango, in Mexico,[3] to the centre of the high table land of that republic, they had subsisted upon the scanty crops which they

---

[101] [1] We adhere to the appellation "Mexicans" out of deference to a custom established. —*Mexica*, or *Mexitin* would be more correct. The former is used by a distinguished scholar. Señor Alfredo Chavero, of the city of Mexico. (See his "Calendario Azteca.") The etymology of the names "Azteca," "Aztlantlaca," and others, is foreign to the purpose of this essay.

[2] See Juan de Torquemada ("Los Veinte y un Libros Rituales y Monarchia Indiana "con el Origen y Guerra de los, Indios-occidentales," Madrid, 1723. Barcia's reprint of the original, which appeared in 1615), Lib. II, cap. XI, pp. 88 and 96, of 1st volume. (He adds that the art of fishing was unknown to the agricultural tribes of the Valley previous to the coming of the Mexicans.) Also, Fray Diego Duran (Historia de las Indias de Nueva España y Islas de Tierra firme, written about 1579-81, and published by Sr. José F. Ramirez, Mexico, 1867), vol. I, chap. IV and V.

[173] [3] Fernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc (Crónica Mexicana,—published in vol. IX. of Kingsborough's Antiquities of Mexico), chap. I, p. 4, "mas de las tierras y montes que "hoy habitan los Chichimecas, que es por Santa Barbara." Duran, in speaking of the "seven caves" (Chicomóztoc), from which the Nahuatl tribes (Mexicans included) all pretended to issue, says: "These caves are in Teoculuacan, otherwise called Aztlan, a "country which we all know to be towards the north, and connected with Florida." (Chap. I, p. 8.) "They went over and through all the country of the Chichimecas, over "the new lands and plains of Cibola." (Chap. II, p. 21.) Cibola, as it has been suggested, was the name given to Zuñi, a pueblo still extant in New Mexico. (see "Historie of the Great and Mightie Kingdom of China, and the situation thereof, etc., etc.," translated from the Spanish of the Padre Juan Gonzalez de Mendoza (1585), by R. Parke, and republished by the Hackluyt Society, in its volume of 1853. (2 volumes.) Zuñi: "the Spaniards do call it Cibola."

We have not the slightest reliable indication concerning the 70 *strength* and numbers of that force.[11] This point is as vague and indefinite as the number of the population of the pueblo itself. Both, being closely connected, suffer from the same contradictions and exaggerations.[12] It is true that a "guard" of 10,000 men is mentioned as having occupied always the square of the main temple ("teocalli").[13] But, aside from the grossly exaggerated numbers, "guards," in the sense of a military body doing permanent duty, were unknown to the Mexicans.[14] The scanty mention of a body guard of Montezuma appears an imaginary tale if we look for its presence where and when it should have been most conspicuous: at the meeting of Montezuma and Cortés on the causeway,[15] and when Cortés carried that chieftain away from his house as a hostage. It is an established fact, that only unarmed Indians [649] met Cortés on his entrance to Mexico, and it is equally positive, that no "guard" came to Montezuma's rescue.

---

stores in sufficient quantities for such a purpose. Within the pueblo of Mexico there was no need of being armed, and therefore every Mexican went unarmed in the pueblo. The "guards" of which Gomara and Bernal-Diez both speak, never existed. See Gomara ("En la ciudad nadie trae armas, ..." p. 345, vol. I, Vedia). [114]

[11] Not even Bernal-Diez contains a statement. Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl ("Relaciones historicas," Relacion XIIIa. in Vol. IX of Lord Kingsborough's Antiquities of Mexico, "De la venida de los Españoles," translated also into the French by Mr. Ternaux-Compans, and published under the title of "Cruautés Horribles des conquérants du Mexique," in the *first* series of his inestimable collection of translations) says: "the Mexicans lost over 240,000 men" during the siege of Mexico. The only reasonable approximate I found in Durán (Hist. de las Indias, etc., cap. XXXVII, pp. 287 and 288). Before the Mexicans (including Tezcuco and Tlacopan and the others of the valley) set out against Michhuacan, in 1479, they counted their forces and found 24,000 men ("allaron que auia veinte y cuatro mil combatientes"). This is possible.

[12] The population of Mexico is variously reported. The extremes are: 60,000 *souls* ("sessanta milla habitatori") of the "Anonymous Conqueror" (Col. de Doc., Icazbalceta. Vol. I, p. 391), and 60,000 *families*. [161]

[13] The length of the walls of that square was "one cross-bow shot," after Gomara. How could 10,000 men *remain there always*, besides the priests and their numerous assistants?

[14] "Guardas" are mentioned by Bernal-Diez del Castillo ("Historia verdadera de la conquista de Nueva-España" in vol. II, of Sr. Vedia's collection, cap. XCV); by Gomara (p. 348 of vol. I, Vedia). Torquemada (Lib. II. cap. VI, p. 544, vol. II), and others. But Cortés and Andrés de Tapia make no mention of them.

[15] Three eye-witnesses of that celebrated meeting have described it: Cortés ("Cartas de Relacion," in Vedia, I, "Carta Segunda," p. 23). Bernal-Diez (Vedia, II, cap. LXXXVIII, p. 83), and Andrés de Tapia ("Relacion hecha por el Señor Andrés de Tapia, sobre la conquista de Mexico," in vol. II, of Icazbalceta's Col. de Documentos, p. 579). Neither of them would have omitted to notice armed men among the Indians, had there been any with Montezuma.

The Mexicans, on their part, could not have failed to make an ostentatious display of armed soldiery, had they existed, when they met the armed strangers at the entrance to the pueblo.

Almost insensibly we have here abandoned the field of the armament of the Mexicans, entering, nay, trespassing, upon that of their *military organization*. 701

This organization is but imperfectly known to us. Still, its knowledge is of the highest importance, since, with a tribe as essentially warlike as the Mexicans, military institutions are often blended with those of civil life, and we may presume that the same principle pervades both; that the degree of development of the one gives a clue to that of the other. According as we picture to ourselves the condition of ancient Mexican society, we shall view and judge their military organization.

All the older authors upon Mexico; and they have been implicitly followed by the great mass of subsequent writers, describe to us a Mexican empire, with an hereditary nobility and an *elective* despot at its head. This autocrat was not only absolute civil chief, he was also Judge and military commander. He declared peace and war, directed the forces, he nominated and deposed officers at his pleasure. Some restraints are allowed, occasionally, to have existed, upon such a power analogous only to that of the despots of Asia, but even the most distinguished writers of *modern* times have unhesitatingly accepted the picture of an absolute Indian monarchy in Mexico.[69] 114

Still this picture, however tempting and fascinating, to imagination especially, has not always satisfied the student's mind. Without placing much stress on the clumsy attacks of James Adair[70] upon the Spanish authors on Mexico, or on De Pauw's injudicious "Researches,"[71] we meet, however, with an earnest and careful criticism in Robertson's classical work. While the great

---

[69] A. de Humboldt ("Essai politique sur la Nouvelle Espagne," 1825, Lib. II, chap. VI, p. 274, "Leur systeme de feodalité, leur hiérarchie civile et militaire se trouvant dés "lors si compliquée, qu'il faut supposer une longue suite, d'évènements politiques pour "que l'enchainement singulier des autorités de la noblesse et du clergé ait pu s'établir; "et pour qu'une petite portion du peuple, esclave elle-même du sultan Méxicain, ait "pu subjuguer la grande masse de la nation"). W. H. Prescott ("History of the Con-"quest of Mexico," Book I, chapter II, p. 23: Book II, chapter VI, p. 312). Brasseur de Bourbourg ("Histoire des Nations civilisées du Mexique et de l'Amérique Centrale"), and H. H. Bancroft (Native Races of the Pacific States"). I quote but the most prominent writers on Mexico of this (19th) century.

[70] James Adair ("History of the American Indians," London, 1775).

[71] "Recherches philosophiques sur les Américains," a very injudicious book, which, by its extravagance and audacity, created a great deal of harm. It permitted Clavigero to attack even Robertson, because the latter had also applied sound criticism to the study of American aboriginal history, and by artfully placing both as upon the same platform, to counteract much of the good effects of Robertson's work.

14:Bandelier E-4 (no date) 1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

114 historian admits and acknowledges whatever appears to him as true and sound in the works of his predecessors, he still takes a different view of the condition of the Mexican aborigines, and indicates, so to say, an entirely new path.[72] It has been the work of the distinguished American ethnologist, Lewis H. Morgan, to open this path fully.[73]

But whereas it is very easy and plain to trace the institutions of the aborigines where they are still in vigor, it is extremely difficult to obtain anything like a clear conception thereof in Mexico, since, as we have already stated, those institutions are gone like their architectural remains, and the other sources for a knowledge thereof are often diffuse, and conflicting in their accounts. Moreover, all the older authorities on Spanish America are under the influence of eastern (European or Asiatic) ideas, whatever appeared to them strange or new in America they compared with what they thought might be analogous to it among nations of the Old World.[74] What, in their first process of thinking was merely a *comparative* became very soon a *positive*, *terminology*, for the

---

[72] "History of America" (9th edition, 1800. Vol. III, book VII, p. 274). "The Mexi- "cans and Peruvians, without knowledge of the useful metals, or the aid of domestic "animals, laboured under disadvantages which must have greatly retarded their pro- "gress, and in their highest state of improvement their power was so limited, and their "operations so feeble, that they can hardly be considered as having advanced beyond "the infancy of civil life." If the first part of this quotation is evidently incorrect, since the Mexicans used copper, silver, and gold, even tin, perhaps, and the Peruvians made alloys;—the latter portion of it is undoubtedly true. He further sustains it by the following remark (Id. p. 281): "The infancy of nations is so long, and, even when every "circumstance is favourable to their progress, they advance so slowly towards any "maturity of strength or policy, that the recent origin of the Mexicans seems to be a "strong presumption of some exaggeration, in the splendid descriptions which have "been given of their government and manners." Notwithstanding those very clear and judicious remarks, Robertson has, though reluctantly, bowed to the admission of feudalism, and of feudal monarchy in Mexico (Id. p. 292).

[73] See "Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family," Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge, Chapter VI, p. 468, "The communal family." Also, "Mon- "tezuma's Dinner," in the "North American Review," April, 1876. The learned author has made a bold stroke for the establishment of American ethnology on a new basis.

[74] "Montezuma's Dinner," p. 267. "All the grand terminology of the Old World, "created under despotic and monarchical institutions during several thousand years "of civilization, to decorate particular men and classes of men, has been lavished by "our author with American prodigality upon plain Indian sachems and war-chiefs, "without perceiving that thereby the poor Indian was grievously wronged, for he had "not invented such institutions nor formed such a society as these terms imply." Mr. Morgan, to whose kindness and friendly protection I am so largely indebted, will not misunderstand it if I say here, that while his criticism of the current of ideas running through all the sources in ancient Mexico appears to me the most true and logical one, his remarks upon the writers themselves are not always justified. This observation, from one whom he has honored by becoming his guide and teacher, will, we trust, be regarded in a kindly spirit.

purpose of describing institutions to which this foreign terminol- 114
ogy never was adapted. It is this expedient, invented in order to become *understood abroad*, and because there were no other points of comparison given by science at that time, which opposes the greatest difficulties to the study of American antiquities. This obstacle may, to a certain extent, be overcome by establishing the true signification of the *native term* for every institution considered, for every office, as far as this is possible; using *native terminology* as indicative of the true character of *native life*. This course we shall attempt to pursue, in treating the military organization of the Mexicans.[75]

The tribe of Mexico had, soon after its settlement in the marsh 174
where the pueblo was subsequently built up, divided into four sec- 619
tions, or "quarters" ("calpulli"),[76] each of these being composed 701
of certain clusters of kindred, "minor quarters," as Torquemada call them.[77] The four great quarters remained as the principal sub-divisions of the tribe for civil as well as military purposes, and the armed men of each constituted a separate body, regardless of

---

[75] Thus the Mexican word for tribe, town, and settlement is the same: "altepetl," [643]
but the Spaniards have applied it to king also (Molina, II, p. 4). The name "tlatoani," which the Mexicans gave to their principal chiefs, and which is translated into king, signifies "one who speaks" ("hablador," Molina, II, p. 141), from "nitlatqa," to speak ("tlatolli," speech). The council was called "tlatocan," "place of speech," but Molina translates it as "court or palace of great lords." The term "speech," or, rather, the verb "to speak," is found in a number of native terms, like "tlatoca-icpalli," "seat of "the one who speaks," which has been rendered, also, as "throne." There is certainly no approach to a royal title in all this. The so-called "King" was only "one of those "who spoke;" a prominent member of the council. A court of justice, "audiencia." was also "tecutlatoloyan," or "chiefs who are speaking, or bowing their heads."

[76] Durán (Cap. V, p. 42). Acosta (Lib. VII, cap. VII, p. 467). Tezozomoc (Cap. III, p. 9). Herrera (Dec. III, lib II, cap. II, p. 61). "Popol Vuh." Introduction, p. 117, note No. 1, by Mr. Brasseur de Bourbourg, "Enfin, presque toutes les villes ou tribus "sont partagées en quatre clans ou quartiers, dont les chefs forment le grand conseil." Tlatilulco, which was conquered by the Mexicans in 1473, subsequently formed a fifth "quarter." The names of the four original ones were: "Teopan" (place of God), "Aztacalco" (house of the heron), "Moyotlan" (place of the musquito), and "cuepopan." They subsequently formed, under Spanish rule, the *wards* of San Pablo, San Juan, Santa Maria la Redonda, and San Sebastian. Tlatilulco became the "Indian-ward," and was called Santiago.

[77] (Lib. XIV, cap. XXI, p. 545) " . . . . y asi estaba ordenado, que en cada pueblo, "conforme tenia el numero, y cantidad de gente, huviese parcialidades de diversas "gentes, y familias . . . . . Estas Parcialidades estaban repartidas por Calpules, "que son Barrios, y sucedia, que una Parcialidad de estas dichas tenia tres, y quatro, "y mas, Calpules, conforme la gente tenia el pueblo, ..." Durán (Cap. V, p. 42) is more explicit, even. After having stated that the Mexicans divided into four principal quarters, he says: "their god commanded them that they should distribute among "themselves the gods, and that each quarter should name and designate particular "quarters where these gods would be worshipped; and thus each quarter divided into

15:Bandelier E-4 (no date)1880 NU7 Aztec NU7

ON THE DISTRIBUTION AND TENURE OF LANDS, AND THE CUSTOMS WITH RESPECT TO INHERITANCE, AMONG THE ANCIENT MEXICANS.

By Ad. F. Bandelier.

000 In a previous paper we have endeavored to describe the warlike customs and organization of the Mexican tribe.[1] Our conclusions in regard to them are somewhat at variance with those generally adopted, since, instead of the military despotism which heretofore has been admitted as existing in ancient Mexico, we found but the military democracy peculiar to a warlike tribe.[2] It is our purpose
121 now to investigate how far the Mexicans may have progressed in their notions about the tenure and distribution of the soil.

114 The picture which nearly all the authors, ancient as well as modern, trace of the condition of aboriginal Mexico is that of a feudal monarchy.[3] This alone should fix permanently the mode of landed tenure. It implies also the notion of abstract ownership, and thus indicates a high state of culture. But we have already

---

[1] "On the Art of War and Mode of Warfare of the Ancient Mexicans," in 10th Annual Report of the Peabody Museum of American Archæology and Ethnology. A

[2] "Art of War, etc., etc., of the Ancient Mexicans," pp. 113, 134, 118, to 127 inclusive, especially the notes. See also "Ancient Society," by Lewis H. Morgan. (N. York, 1877.) Part II, chapter VII, "The Aztec Confederacy," pp. 186–214 inclusive.

[3] The first information tending to represent the condition of Mexico as a feudal state was probably furnished by Cortés; or through his expedition at least. The reports of the preceding voyage of Grijalva (1518) contain no positive statements. On the other hand the certificate issued by Cortés (probably about the 20 May, 1519, or 29 days after his landing at Ulua), to the chiefs of Axapusco and Tepeyahualco, already
[243] speaks of, "the great Montezuma, which resides in this great city of Tenochtitlán and all its provinces." We have not Cortés' first letter to the emperor, but in his second report, 30 Oct., 1520, he mentions "a great Lord called Mutezuma." (Vedia, "Historiadores primitivos de Indias," Vol. I. Carta Segunda, pp. 12 and 13.) The same dispatch contains a number of details on Montezuma's power, from which a feudal empire was necessarily construed as for last. (p. 33): "There are in this great city many very large and fine houses, the cause of it being that all the *Lords of the land, vassals of the said Mu-*
[642] *tezuma*, have their houses in that city . . . . ." "What has been ascertained is: that his sovereignty was almost as large as Spain . . ." (p. 34.) Gomara, who published his "Conquista de Méjico" in 1552, already mentions "thirty lords of one-hundred-thousand vassals each, and three-thousand lords of places." (Vedia I, p. 345. "Corte y guarda de Motezuma.") Oviedo ("Historia general y natural de Indias," Vol. III, Lib.

REPORT PEABODY MUSEUM, II. 25. A [See H; Bandelier, this file.--Analyst]

[p. 385]

114 seen that the institutions of the Mexicans were democratic and not monarchical, that their chiefs and leaders filled elective, and in no case hereditary positions.[4] This latter fact whose final discussion we reserve for another occasion, speaks strongly against the existence of privileged classes, based upon territory and landed property; therefore it also militates against feudality itself.

121 Still we cannot permit ourselves to become prejudiced by such indications, against the views generally accepted. They merely warn us of the *difficulties of our task.* These difficulties are greater yet than those against which we contended in our first essay. The military life of the Mexicans has furnished the bulk of their history, and through it a number of facts, by which the former could be almost restored. The question of distribution of the soil, however, apparently relates to *customs* only; broken up and to a great extent obliterated centuries ago. Nevertheless, accessory facts, and especially a merely cursory review of the history of the Mexican tribe, may enable us yet to form an idea of these customs. The Mexican rules of inheritance are in direct connection with them also, and lastly, the *acts of the Spaniards* during the first times after the conquest, when they more or less suddenly overturned the ancient order of things, should bring to light many forgotten features of aboriginal tenure and distribution of the soil.

Having thus sketched the programme — so to say — of our work, we have yet to offer two explanations ere we proceed to enter upon the discussion proper, itself.

In the first place: by "accessory facts," we refer to the *social organization* of the Mexicans in particular. It is inseparable from

---

XXXIII, cap. XLVI, p. 503) again speaks of "more than three thousand lords his subjects, each one of many vassals, and each held his principal dwelling in Temistitan, residing there certain months each year." The author, a friend of Columbus, and personally acquainted with all the eminent men of the conquest, resided at the West Indies and Nicaragua until 1526 (his stay though interrupted by at least six voyages to Spain and back), was one of the most cautious and best situated of the old chroniclers. But the chief originator of the feudal view is Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl, a half breed of Tezcuco, and belonging to the kin of that tribe's chieftains. He wrote about the year 1600, and both of his works, the "Relaciones historicas," and the "Historia de los Chichimecas é reyes antiguos de Tezcuco," present, it should not be denied, a picture of logical development of feudal institutions on Mexican soil. Torquemada of course concurs. We hope to be able to investigate, elsewhere, the claims of Ixtlilxochitl to the rank of a reliable source. Fairness, however, compels us here to mention the above authors, as the mainstays of current opinion.

[4] "Art of War," etc., pp. 95, 128 and 141.

landed tenure, and we therefore must recur to it frequently in the 21 course of our allusions to the history of the tribe.

Secondly: we do not pretend to review the history of ancient [128] Mexico as fully as it *should* be done, but only as far as it touches the subject of this paper. Many points therefore, which ought to be closely scrutinized, will be passed over lightly, or without any discussion.

One of the most learned authors of the 16th century, on American 114 topics,—the Jesuit father Joseph de Acosta, says: "Learned men affirm and write that the relations and the memories of these Indians do not go further back than four-hundred years. . . . ."[5]

Indeed, although much has been written about the aboriginal 173 history of Mexico, it appears as if the 12th century was the *limit* of *definite tradition*.[6] What lies beyond it is vague and uncertain, remnants of traditions being intermingled with legends and mythological fancies. Nothing positive can be gathered except that, even during the earliest times, Mexico was settled or overrun by 174 sedentary, as well as by nomadic tribes,—that both acknowledged

---

[5] "Historia natural y moral de las Indias," Lib. I, cap. XXV, p. 85. The passage relates directly to Peru, but is just as applicable to Mexico.

[6] "We venture to assume this period as the one during which traditional history of [114] Mexico really begins. Of course, those writers who have made the fabrication of a Mexican chronology a special object, go much further back. The late Abbé Brasseur de Bourbourg, for instance, quotes the "Codex Chimalpopoca," purported to bear date 22 May. 1558, and which begins as follows (History of the three suns). "This is the beginning of the histories of all kinds which happened a long time ago, how the earth was divided, and distributed to each one, its origin and foundation, how the sun began to give to each one his share, assigning the limits; there are now six times four-hundred years, and one-hundred more, and thirteen more . . . ." The distinguished historian concludes therefrom, that 955 B. C. there occurred already, in Middle America, a division of lands according to a systematic register ("Popol-Vuh." Introduction, page CXi). Clavigero's Chronology begins 596 A. D. ("Storia del Messico," Lib. II, cap. I). Don Mariano Veytia ("Historia Antigua de Méjico," published by Sr. Ortega, 1836), after fixing the date of the establishment of "Huehuetlapallan," to the year 2237 of the earth's creation (Vol. I, cap. II, p. 23), or 1796 B. C. (p. 219) begins for the settlement of the Toltecs at Tolantzinco in 667 A. D. (Cap. XXII, p. 121, of 1st volume). Ixtlilxochitl ("Histoire des Chichimèques ou des anciens rois de Tezcuco," translation by Mr. Ternaux Compans) says: (Cap. II p. 18) that the Toltecs founded Tollam 503 A. D. No reliance can be placed on these statements and dates. They are not any longer traditional, but mythical, and although we are far from disregarding the importance of legends or myths for historical investigations, we still cannot accept them as chronological bases. The oldest date in the history of Mexico which appears to be approximately certain is that of the settlement of the Mexicans in the marsh where they subsequently built the pueblo of Tenochtitlan. It would about agree with A. D. 1325. Allowing two centuries more for the period during which the Mexicans and their kindred tribes reached the valley, we are carried to the twelfth century as the time from which distinct tradition has yet reached us. What lies beyond can occasionally be rendered of value for ethnological purposes, but it admits of no definite historical use.

174 sometimes associated (or even perhaps *confederated*) against surrounding tribes.[14]

These settlers, who all spoke closely related dialects of the same language as their predecessors the Toltecs, namely: the "Nahuatl" or *good sound*, were: the *Aculhuans or Tezcucans*, the *Tecpanecas*, the *Xochimilcas*, and the *Chalcas*. The first settled on the Eastern shore of the central lagune, the second to the west of it, while the two last-named tribes clustered around the fresh-water basins of the southeast. In this manner the valley was eventually mastered again by sedentary Indians, who held at bay the surrounding savages;—also defending it from neighbors of their own stock who, occupying at the same time contiguous areas placed under different geographical conditions, while their organization and plan of life were similar, and the language but dialectically varied;—still, eventually, became their most inveterate enemies.[15]

114 174 Although quite a respectable literature has arisen on the subject of the organization, customs and manners of these "Nahuatl" tribes of the valley of Mexico, this literature is much richer in facts purporting to be *historical* than in satisfactory *details* on *that subject itself*. We can but discern among the confusions and contradictions (of older authors particularly)—that the different tribes were democratic societies, based upon consanguine groups as units. Chiefs, *elected by the people*, formed their governments, whose highest authorities were the *councils*. The Tezcucans and Tecpanecans seem to have had each *one*, the Chalcas *two*, *head war-chiefs*, elected for life. In regard to their mode of holding and distributing the soil the most varied statements are given, most of these, however, based upon the assumption of monarchial institutions, and even of a great feudal empire with Tezcuco as its capital. Both of

---

[14] The reports about a preponderance of certain tribes, such as the Tezcucans or the Tecpanecans, resolve themselves into a result of intertribal relations in the valley of Mexico. We need but consult the writings of Ixtlilxochitl for that purpose. (See "Hist. des Chichimèques" cap. XI, XII, XIV, and XVI). Torquemada (Lib. I, cap. XXXVII, p. 66).

[15] For a history of the different tribes composing the specifically latest immigration of "Nahuatl" stock, we refer to all the older authors on Mexican topics. Those of their kindred who settled outside of the valley were especially the Tlaxcallans. The relations of the latter to the valley-tribes were always rather unfriendly. See Torquemada (Lib. III, cap. IX, p. 228, and 229. Cap. XI, p. 264, and 265). Durán (Cap. II, p. 12). But the continuous wars between Tlaxcallan and the tribes of the valley commenced when the latter began to extend their sway under the leadership of the Mexicans (Ixtlilxochitl "Hist. des Chichimèques" cap. XLI, p. 288). It is corroborated by the statements of the Tlaxcaltecas themselves to Cortés ("Carta Segunda," p. 18, Vedia, Vol. I).

these assumptions are disproved by the facts, related even by such 114 authors as have most contributed towards fixing them upon the 174 public mind as recognized truths.[16] We need hardly say here,

[16] In regard to the Tecpanecas, Acosta says (Lib. VII, cap. II, p. 477): "From this 184 it may be inferred, that among them the King exercised no absolute command and rule, 642 and that he was rather a consul, or Dux, than a king." He further compares the Tecpanecas with the "reges" of ancient Rome (See Morgan's "Ancient Society," Part II, 643 cap. XI, p. 297). The council was supreme among the Tecpanecans. See Tezozomoc ("Crónica Mexicana," Lord Kingsborough, Vol. IX, cap. IV, p. 11; also cap. V, p. 12, cap. VI, p. 13, "a esto respondió el rey y senado Tecpaneca: Digéroule: mira atempanecatl (que muy bien le conocian) bien conozco la humillacion y sugecion de los Mexicanos; ya es por demas, porque estan alborotados, y corajudos los Tecpanecas:") Durán (Cap. VIII, p. 64, and 65).

The Xuchimilcas were governed by two chiefs (Tezozomoc, cap. XVI, p. 25. Durán, cap. XII, p. 104. "Their chiefs, of which there were two, one of the chief-place ("cabecera" rather lineage) of Xuchimilco called Yacaxapotecutli, and the other from the milpa (this is to be interpreted as descendancy), which is called Pachimalcatltecutli, and together with them meeting many principals, said"): a joint meal after communal style is also attributed to them by Tezozomoc (Cap. XVI, p. 26).

The Chalcas also had two chiefs: (Durán, cap. XVI, p. 134, Montezuma Ilhuicamina said to Tlacaelel: "I wish, if thou agreest, to send messengers to Chalco to the chief of Chalco Quateotl and to his companion Toteociteculli . . . ."—Tezozomoc, cap. XXII, p. 23. Cap. XXIV, p. 26. Confirmed by the action of Cortés after the voluntary surrender of Chalco, when he installed two chiefs. Bernal Diez: cap. CXXXIX, p. 154 and 155, Vedia, II).

With the Tezcucans or Aculhuas there appears always but one head-chief, but it is equally positive that the office, while remaining in a certain kin, was elective still. The fact is interesting and requires close proof. We adduce here, in a general way, Sahagun (Lib. VIII, cap. XXX. "De la Manera que tuvieron en elegir los señores," p. 318, of 2d Vol.): Durán (Cap. LXIV, p. 496). "Montezuma sent his messengers to Tezcuco, and had all the chiefs of that city and kingdom called to learn from them whom they were inclined to elect . . . ." (p. 497), "the which came, electing for King to Quetzalacxoyatzin, Neçaualpilli's son . . . ." Tezozomoc (Cap. CI and CII). Ixtlilxochitl concurs ("Histoire des Chichimèques," cap. LXXXVI). Torquemada (Lib. XI, cap. XXVII, pp. 257, 258 and 259), acknowledges that, while the choice was among the *sons* exclusively, there still was a *choice* left, but he contradicts the statements of Juan Bautista Pomar (who wrote about 1582) who says, that this choice extended to the entire *kin* of the deceased head chief. Mendieta (Lib. II, cap. XXXVII, p. 155). "Although the Indians of this New Spain inherited the chieftaincy in direct lines, they took great care in ascertaining which one of his sons had to succeed to him." He mentions the succession in the cases of Netzahualcoyotl and of Netzahualpilli, each of whom were respectively followed by what he calls an illegitimate offspring, but whose mother was a *Mexican* woman. Veytia (Cap. XIV, p. [illegible]). "The council hardly had been informed of the King's death, when it thought proper to elect a successor, after the manner of the Mexicans . . . ." Carlos Maria de Bustamante ("Tezcoco en los Ultimos Tiempos de sus antiguos Reyes," Mexico, 1826. Part III, cap. IV, pp. 218, 219 and 220). Alonzo de Zurita ("Rapport sur les différentes classes de chefs de la Nouvelle-Espagne" translation by Mr. Ternaux-Compans, p. 12). "The order of succession varied according to the provinces, the same custom, with slight differences, prevailing in Mexico, Tezcuco and Tacuba."

The assumption of a feudal empire at Tezcuco has already been discussed. It was an invention of chroniclers, who had a direct interest, or thought to have one, in advancing the claims of the Tezcuçan tribe to an original supremacy. Tribal jealousy and rivalry, such a powerful ally of the Spaniards during the conquest, continued to subsist where the Spanish domination was fully established.

114 that all the tribes of Mexico, issuing from a common stock, 174 speaking the "Nahuatl" tongue, and living under the same geographical influences,[17] had reached an almost identical state of culture. Therefore the result of our investigations of the landed tenure among the Mexican tribe proper, can safely be assumed as applicable to all the other sedentary tribes of (the valley of) Mexico.[18]

174 While thus horticultural tribes had secured the fertile portions of that valley, dividing its expanse among themselves, and separated by unoccupied "neutral" soil,[19]—a small band of their own linguistical relationship was moving down from the North, and ultimately made its appearance in their midst. Those were the *Mexicans* proper, also called "*Aztecas Mexitin*," "*Aztlantlacas*" or "*Mexica*."[20] This band was composed of Seven Kinships "lineages," whose chiefs jointly composed the government of the whole, a head war-chief, elected for life, directed their movements, but

---

[17] The difference between the valley tribes and those of the Tlaxcaltecan mountain country, is not even very great. It is in fact but apparent. From the nature of the soil, the kinships of Tlaxcallan were more scattered in location, and therefore were apparently democratic. The same was the case among the Niquirans of Nicaragua. See Oviedo (Lib. XLII, cap. I, pp. 37 and 38), and E. G. Squier. ("Nicaragua," Vol. II. "Aborigines of Nicaragua," cap. II, p. 340–348).

[648] [18] Otherwise the confederacy, on equal terms, existing between the valley-tribes for more than a century previous to the conquest, and of which we shall hereafter treat, could not have been formed, neither could it have subsisted. The fact, however, that all the old chroniclers mention the tribes of Mexico under one common head, and describe their customs, as, in the main, identical,—proves that we can safely assume the Mexicans as typical in that respect. Some tribes were more advanced in certain mechanical arts than others,—but the difference was merely one of details, and not of organic principles.

[131] [19] See "Art of War," p. 135. The boundary line mentioned by Ixtlilxochitl (Histoire des Chichimèques," cap. XXXIII, p. 125), and also by Veytia (Cap. III of Book III. p. 167 of 3rd volume) if, as the latter asserts, it ever really existed, did not divide so much the territory of the tribes, but rather the range over which each one might freely extend, after the formation of the confederacy. Sr. Veytia contends that the remnants of it were still visible at his time, and carried the name "albarrada de los indios."

[226] [20] "Art of War," p. 96, note 1. We have alluded to the common appellation of "Chichimecas." Sahagun (Lib. X, cap. XXIX, p. 147), says: "properly they call themselves Atlacachichimeca, or fishermen that have come from distant lands." This would be a corroboration, to some extent, of Torquemada's assertion (Lib. II, cap. XI, pp. 92 and 93) that the Mexicans introduced the art of fishing in the Mexican valley. We cannot help being struck by the prefixum, "Atlaca." If it decomposes into "Atl," water, and "tlacatl," man, it assigns to the Mexicans an original abode in the neighborhood of the sea, or of very large water-courses. Tezozomoc, in his first chapter, speaking of Aztlan, whence the Mexicans are said to have emigrated, and from which word the name of "Azteca" is derived, says: "They had in this land and the *lagunes* thereof . . . ." (p. 5). Aztlan itself means "place of the heron," which is an aquatic bird. (See also Veytia, Lib. II, cap. XII, p. 91). He places "Aztlan" towards the extreme north.

618 NOT, as Torquemada admits, *assigned* to it *by a higher power*,[32] *the tribal government itself held* NO DOMAIN which it might apportion among subdivisions or to individuals, either gratuitously or on condition of certain prestations; or barter against a consideration.[33] The tribal territory was distributed, at the time of its occupancy, *into possessory rights held by* the KINDRED GROUPS AS SUCH, by common and tacit consent, as resulting *naturally* from their *organization* and *state of culture*.[34]

618 The patches of solid ground, on which these "quarters" settled,
174 were gradually built over with dwellings, first made out of canes
361 and reeds, and latterly, as their means increased, of turf, "adobe"
342 and light stone. These houses were of *large size*, since it is stated that even at the time of the conquest "there were seldom less than two, four, and six dwellers in one house, thus there were infinite people (in the pueblo) since as there was no other way of providing for them, many aggregated together as they might please." *Communal living*, as the idea of the "calpulli" implies, seems, therefore, to have prevailed among the Mexicans *as late as the period of their greatest power*.[35]

---

114 [32] Torquemada (Lib. II, cap. VIII, p. 88, and Lib. III, cap. XXIV, p. 295) attributes the division into "quarters" to a "decree" of the Chichimecan "emperor" Techotlalatzin. But his assertions are disproved in part by his own statements, in part by the positive reports of other authors. Admitting even that the said Techotlalatzin should have wielded the discretionary power attributed to him, although there is strong evidence against it, he would have ruled *after* the foundation of Mexico. (Clavigero, Lib. II, cap. IX. Veytia, Lib. II, cap. XX, p. 178.) Consequently *after* the settling and localizing of the four quarters mentioned had taken place.

642 [33] The division into "quarters" is everywhere represented as resulting from common consent. But nowhere is it stated that the *tribal government or authority* assigned locations to any of its fractions. This is only attributed to the chiefs, on the supposition that they, although *elective*, were still hereditary monarchs.

642 [34] There is no evidence of any tribute or prestation due by the quarters to the tribe. The custom always remained, that the "calpulli" was sovereign within its limits. See Alonzo de Zurita ("Rapport sur les différentes classes de chefs de la Nouvelle-Espagne" pp. 51–63). Besides, Ixtlilxochitl says: ("Hist. des Chichim," cap. XXXV, p. 242), "Other fields were called Calpolalli or Altepetlalli." Now calpulalli (from "calpulli," quarter or kinship, and "tlalli," soil), means soil of the kin, and altepetlalli ("altepetl," tribe), soil of the tribe. Clavigero even says that the lands called "altepetlalli," belonging to the communities "of the towns and villages, were divided into so many parts, as there were quarters in the town, each quarter *having its own, without the least connection with the other*." (Lib. VII, cap. XIV.) This indicates plainly that the kinships *held the soil*, whereas the tribe occupied the territorial expanse. The *domain*, either as pertaining to a "Lord," or to a "State," was unknown among the Indians in general. Even among the Peruvians, who were more advanced than the Mexicans in that respect, there was no domain of the tribe.

[35] See Torquemada (Lib. II, cap. XI, and Lib. III, cap. XXII). Durán (cap. V). The quotation is from Herrera (Dec. II, Lib. VII, cap. XIII, p. 190), and is confirmed by Torquemada (Lib. III, cap. XXIII, p. 291), and especially by Gomara ("Conquista de

tribute was gathered by stewards, the only Mexicans permanently 728 residing on Tecpanecan soil, and it was distributed in accordance with the tribal organization: among the calpules for the use of their public households and of their individual members, and to the "tecpan" for the maintenance of the tribal government and business; out of the former, a certain share was reserved for the purpose of religious worship.[56]

This tribute consisted of objects held and acquired by the 651 Tecpanecas through trade, war and their own manufacture. But it also included the products of their *horticulture*. These had to be raised annually either on their own garden-beds, or on a certain expanse reserved in each "calpulli" for the production of tribute. The Tecpanecas having the same system of distribution of the soil as the Mexicans, and the kindred group being the unit of their organization also, the latter method was naturally resorted to. Therefore in each one of the areas held by the calpules of the conquered tribe, a certain plot was set off, to be tilled in common by the members of the kin, for the benefit of their conquerors.

---

[56] Acosta says (Lib. VII, cap. XIII, p. 465), that they took all the lands for themselves: "with this, those of Azcapuzalco were left so poor, that they had not even crops of their own." Durán (Cap. IX, p. 79. "They went to Azcaputzalco and seized ('se entregaron') its lands and distributed them among themselves.") Tezozomoc (Cap. IX, p. 16 and 17). It is difficult to connect these and similar statements with the positive facts asserted by Zurita (Rapport sur les différentes classes de chefs de la Nouvelle [114] ● Espagne.") "The sovereign of Mexico had beneath him, in all matters relating to warfare, those of Tacuba and of Tezcuco; in regard to all others, their powers were equal, so that neither of them intervened in the government of the others" (p. 11),—by Veytia (Lib. III, cap. III, p. 161), and even by Ixtlilxochitl ("Hist. des Chichim.," Cap. XXXIV, p. 225), which establish the complete *territorial* independence of the Tecpanecas from the Mexicans; even after their defeat. Durán also says (Cap. IX, p. 77): that the Tecpanecas promised tribute and lands. Tezozomoc (Cap. IX, p. 16) confirms, stating that they offered tribute, personal service, and assistance in war. We cannot conciliate these different reports except by admitting that the Tecpanecas submitted to the ordinary manner of Indian conquest, namely: to tribute, to military aid, and for the purpose of tribute, to the reservation of certain tracts whose crops were to go exclusively to the conquerors. Of the latter we have positive proof. See Durán (Cap. IX, p. 79). Tezozomoc (Cap. IX, p. 17). Only these authors mention that these tracts went to persons or individuals. But how is this possible, since no individual possession of land appears in Mexico, at the time of the conquest even; as we shall see further on. The tracts in question must, therefore, have been given to such persons as representatives of certain kinships, or "calpules," as Tezozomoc intimates, saying (Cap. XV, p. 21): "and let us distribute the lands among all of us, in order to hold of them some pastime and sustenance for us, our children and heirs." Besides, Durán asserts: that the division took place for the benefit of the chiefs, and of the quarters ("barrios," or calpules), which tends to prove that there were "official lands" and "lands of the kinship" set off for the conquerors on the conquered territory. That a portion of the latter provided for religious purposes, is established by Acosta (Lib. VII, cap. XIII, p. 465), and by Durán (Cap. IX).

648 fief, still virtually created,—what his subsequently became in Spanish America,—a *domain* of the Spanish crown. Armed with it, and fully convinced of its validity,[117] the Spaniards regarded at once the soil of Mexico as their king's own, and therefore claimed the right as his agents, to dispose of it through distribution according to their home-laws and customs. But, instead of proclaiming this title at once after the landing, as was done on many other points of the American coast,[118] Cortés found it advisable to delay such a formal declaration until after he had, by his own inspection, satisfied himself of the proper ways and means to secure possession. He quickly found out the disconnected state of the country, although he attributed it to causes which were not really existing,[119] and it is well known how he improved it for his plans. He therefore treated secretly, as much as possible, with members of tribes subjected (or rather tributary) to the Mexicans and their confederates,[120] and in consideration of their espousing the Spanish cause, he promised them sundry favors.[121] The oldest document issued by Europeans on Mexican soil embodies such a negotiation with chiefs of the tribes of Axapusco and Tepeyahualco, both pueblos being situated within the valley of Mexico itself.[122] It promises

---

[117] Herrera (Dec. I, lib. II, cap. IV, p. 41). Oviedo (Lib. II, cap. VIII, pp. 31 and 32). Gomara (Vedia I, p. 168). Mendieta (Lib. I, cap. III, pp. 16-20), and many others. All these authorities can be summed up in Robertson's classical words: "The Pope, as vicar and representative of Jesus Christ, was supposed to have a right of dominion over all the kingdoms of the earth" ("History of America," 9th Edition, 1800. Vol. I, Book II, p. 159). It appears that already Grijalva had, in 1518, taken possession formally of the Mexican coast. (Oviedo, Lib. XVII, cap. XV, p. 525)

[118] Herrera (Dec. I, lib. VII, cap. XIV, pp. 197 and 198). Robertson (Vol. I, Book III, p. 271; also note XXIII, p. 578).

[119] Cortés supposed a Mexican state or empire and his measures were taken in consequence. ("Carta Segunda," Vedia I, p. 12). Gomara ("Conq. de Mèjico," p. 313). Bernal-Diez del Castillo ("Hist. verd. de la conq. de N. España," Vedia II, pp. 22 and 23). Oviedo (Lib. XXXIII, cap. II, p. 261). Torquemada (Lib. IV, cap. XVI, pp. 266 and 267), etc. etc.

[120] Cortés ("Carta Segunda," Vedia I, pp. 13 and 15). Bernal-Diez (Vedia II, cap. XLI, p. 36). Oviedo (Lib. XXXIII, cap. II, p. 261). Andrés de Tapía ("Col. de Documentos," of Icazbalceta, Vol. II, pp. 561 and 562). Gomara ("Conq. de Méjico," Vedia, I, p. 320). But the main evidence is furnished by the document published by Icazbalceta in his second volume of the "Coleccion de Documentos para la Historia de Mexico," in the 2d volume, and entitled: "Real Ejecutoria de S. M. Sobre Tierras y Reservas de Pechos y Paga, perteneciente á los Caciques de Axapusco, de la jurisdiccion de Otumba" (pp. 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9).

[121] "Real Ejecutoria" (Col. de doc. II, p. 7). Gomara (Vedia I, p. 320). Clavigero (Lib. VIII, cap. XI).

114 [122] The pueblos of Axapusco and Tepeyahualco are situated along the road leading
423 from the city of Mexico to Tullanzinco, in the state of Mexico proper, northwest of San Juan de Teotihuacan. As the Document to which we have already referred im-

to those chiefs lands of their own. The grantees had no conception 648
of the true import of what they accepted, neither did Cortés conceive the nature of *their* ideas. It was the object of the Indians

---

plies, they were under Spanish rule included in the jurisdiction of Otumba. This docu- 114
ment itself requires particular attention. It has been published by Sr. Icazbalceta in 648
the second volume of his documentary collections, and its authenticity has been carefully 423
examined—and, we think, successfully proven—by Sr. José F. Ramirez. Its history is not devoid of interest, and we record it here, partly from the document itself, and partly from the introduction and notes by the late Sr. Ramirez.

On the 9th day of March, 1617, there appeared before the viceroy of New Spain (Marques of Guadalcazar), Leonardo de Salazar "in the name of the governor, alcalde and fiscals" of the pueblo of San Esteban Axapusco and Santiago Tepeyahualco, "of the jurisdiction of Otumba," praying for a confirmation in writing by the viceroy, of a certain grant made by Cortés, and approved by the King and his royal council under seal,—to the aforesaid pueblos. In order to obtain said confirmation it was alleged: that the grant, written on "nine leaves" was so torn and damaged, that it would no longer bear handling,—and that through its loss the inhabitants of said settlements might come to grief. The petition was immediately granted and it was ordained, on the 19 of March 1617, that a copy of the original grant should be executed, and that in such places where the text was torn or obliterated through damage to the originals, common belief or tradition should prevail as far as it related to the contents of the document ("obre la fé que hubiere lugar en derecho"). The desired copy and certificates were accordingly issued on the 21st day of March, 1617.

This copy embodies the mutilated text of a very singular official paper. It appears from it that on the 20th day of May 1519, Cortés executed, in favor of two Indian chiefs of the two aforesaid pueblos, and at their request, a certificate (signed by himself at San Juan de Ulúa on that day and countersigned: Pedro Hernandez), stating that the said chiefs had joined the messengers sent from Mexico to greet and espy Cortés upon his arrival at the coast,—with the intention of approaching him secretly and offering him their assistance in any designs he might have against the Mexicans, whom they said held them severely to tribute. This they achieved, and took allegiance to the crown of Spain. In return Cortés promised to them that "after our journey should be accomplished . . . . . to them should in the first place be made the greatest honor possible in return for so much noble subtility and good-will." He also promised "to make them grandees and Lords of lands where they now have their pueblos." The facts thus alleged were contained in the original document, written consequently about 30 days after the landing of Cortés on the coast of Vera Cruz. But this act itself was included, as a copy, in a further grant, dated 16 December, 1526, in which Cortés acknowledges the services rendered by the two chiefs during the conquest of Mexico, and that after that pueblo had been captured, the said chiefs returned to their tribes "well paid with the booty," relying upon the fulfilment of his original promises. It further states that: six years having elapsed since, and to most of the chiefs who had assisted the Spanish cause, lands had been given, he remembered the chiefs of Axapusco and Tepeyahualco, "and by these presents in the royal name of His majesty gave them four tracts ("cuatro sitios de estancias") . . . . . in the territory of their said pueblos." These lands were freed from all taxes and impositions, and the chiefs and their heirs were invested forever with the lordship and the office of governors ("gobernadores") of the pueblo to which they belonged. This grant of Cortés was confirmed by the Emperor Charles V, and the royal council of the Indies, 2d November, 1537, and on the 9 and 10 February, 1540, the said chieftains were duly installed in their new hereditary positions, and their lands measured off to them.

Doubts were raised as to the genuineness of the document, but these are set aside completely by the fact that, not more than 98 years after its first execution, the Spanish authorities have legally acknowledged it. Some objections relating to imperfections in the text, apparent anachronisms, have been eliminated through the judicious

631
648 This eliminates at once the notion of a Mexican state or empire, embracing in the folds of political society [5] all the groups of abor-

---

la segunda poblacion de las del Valle." Farther on, quoting *Juan Bautista Pomar*, "*Relacion de la ciudad de Tezcuco*," (MSS., belonging to Sr. Icazbalceta, and dated 1582) who says of Tezcuco: "La extension del reino era desde el mar del N. á la del Sur, con todo lo que se comprende á la banda del Poniente hasta el puerto de la Vera Cruz, salvo la Ciudad de Tlachcala y Huexotzinco," the learned ethnographer adds, (p. 242), "Juan B. Pomar fija los limites del reino con toda la exaggeracion que puede infundir el orgullo de raza. Por nuestra parte, hemos leido con cuidado las relaciones que á la monarquía corresponden, y hemos estudiado en el plano los lugares à que se refieren, y ni de las unas ni de las otras llegamos á sacar jamas que los reyes de Acolhuacan mandaron sobre las tribus avecindadas in la costa del Pacifico, no ya à la misma de México, sino aun á menores latitudes." He then enters upon a discussion of the number and names of settlements which gave tribute exclusively to Tezcuco. We can only refer to it in general here, as one of the most valuable contributions to Mexican history, and based upon authorities which ought to be published as soon as possible, some of which we mention for the benefit of students:—

[114] (1). "*Memorial dirigido al rey por Don Hernando Pimentel Nezcavualcuyutl, cacique y gobernador de la provincia de Tezcuco, etc.*" This is the celebrated Report used by Torquemada and Fernando de Alba Ixtlilxochitl, and which the Cavaliere Boturini Benaducci owned.

(2). "*Relacion de Sempuhuala del corregidor Luis Obregon*," 1580, MSS.
(3). "*Relacion de Epazoyuca por el corregidor Luis Obregon*." 1580, MSS.
(4). "*Relacion de Tetliztaca por el corregidor Luis Obregon*," 1580, MSS.
(5). "*Relacion de Meztitlan por el alcalde mayor Gabriel de Chavez*," 1589, MSS.
(6). "*Relacion de Atengo por el corregidor Juan de Padilla*," 1579, MSS.
(7). "*Relacion de Atlatlauca por el corregidor Gaspar de Solis*," 1580, MSS.
(8). "*Relacion de Acapiztla por el alcalde mayor Juan Gutierrez de Liebana*," 1580, MSS.
(9). "*Relacion de Culhuacan por el corregidor Gonzalo Gallego*," 1580, MSS.
(10). "*Relacion de Iztapalapa por el corregidor Gonzalo Gallego*." 1580, MSS.

Since most of these valuable MSS. are the property of Sr. J. G. Icazbalceta, an early publication thereof may be hoped for.

Sr. Orozco y Berra now reaches the important conclusion:

(*a*). That Acolhuacan or Tezcuco had settlements tributary to it alone, (p. 246).
(*b*). That the "Empire" had tributaries of itself.
(*c*). That certain pueblos paid tribute both to Tezcuco and to Mexico, (p. 246), Epazoyuca, "pertenecieron tambien á Tetzcoco, y en el reinado de Itzcoatl quedaron por mitad para México y para Tetzcoco, á fin de que de alli sacaran los imperiales las navajas para sus macanas." Taken probably from Relacion 3.

The "Imperiales" were, therefore, the confederates, and the "Imperio" the confederacy. But if, within the area conquered by these confederates, each one of them received its share of tributary tribes, how could it be their task or tendency to unify or nationalize, since each of the three associates composed but a part of that power, and their association was a voluntary one?

(2). None of the confederates exercised any power over the others, beyond the exclusively military direction delegated to the Mexicans proper. "*Rapport sur les différentes classes de chefs de la Nouvelle Espagne, Par Alonzo de Zurita*," translated from the Spanish original by Mr. Ternaux Compans, and printed in 1840, by him in his "*Voyages Relations et Mémoires originaux pour servir à l' histoire de la découverte de l' Amérique*," (p. 11). "La province de Mexico était soumise à trois principaux chefs: celui de Mexico, celui de Tezcuco et celui de Tlacopan, que l'on nomme aujourd' hui Tacuba. Tous les chefs inférieurs relevaient de ces souverains et leur obéissaient. Les trois chefs supérieurs formaient une confédération et se partageaient les provinces dont ils s'emparaient. Le souverain de Mexico avait au dessous de lui ceux de Tezcuco et de Tacuba pour les affaires qui avaient rapport à la guerre; quant à toutes les autres, leurs puissances étaient égales, de sorte que l' un d' eux ne se mêlait jamais du

174 It is much to be regretted that our information on this point
114 is so meagre and unsatisfactory, as not to enable us to ascertain
619 whether several *entire kins* separated from the rest to form the new tribe, or whether *fragments of kins* only composed the secessionists. In fact even the cause of the division is stated in such a varied and contradictory manner, that we must withhold any expression of positive views on the subject.

618 Without losing sight altogether of the tribe of Tlatilulco, we still must devote our attention chiefly to the inhabitants of Tenuchtitlan, in which we recognize the ancient Mexicans proper. The number of kins composing the latter at the time of their

---

divided in two "bands," without saying why and how this division occurred. *Durán* (Cap. V, p. 43), "Hecha esta division y puestos ya en su órden y concierto de barrios, algunos de los viejos y ancianos, entendiendo merecian mas de lo que les daban y que no se les hacia aquella honra que merecian, se amotinaron y determinaron ir a buscar nuevo asiento, y andando por entre aquellos carriçales y espadañales allaron una albarrada pequeña, y dando noticia della á sus aliados y amigos fuéronse á hacer alli asiento, el qual lugar se llamaba Xaltelulli y el qual lugar agora llamamos Tlatilulco, quees el barrio de Santiago. Los viejos y principales que alli se pasauan fuéron quatro; el uno dellos se llamaba Atlaquauitl, el segundo Huicto, el tercero Opochtli, el quarto Atlacol. Estos quatro señores se dividieron y apartaron de los demas y se fuéron á vivir á este lugar del Tlatilulco, y segun opinion tenidos por hombres inquietos y revoltosos y de malas intenciones, porque desde el dia que alli se pasaron nunca tuvieron paz ni se llevaron bien con sus hermanos los mexicanos; la qual inquietud a ido de mano en mano hasta el dia de hoy, pues siempre a auido y ay bandos y rancor entre los unos y los otros." *Acosta* (Lib. VII, cap. VIII, p. 468), and *Herrera* (Dec. III, lib. II, cap. XII, p. 62), both are but concise repetitions of the above. *Torquemada* (Lib. III, cap. XXIV, pp. 294 and 295), opposes both Acosta and Herrera, as well as the "*Codex Ramirez*," and substitutes a story about voluntary settlement of the Tlatilulca on a sandy patch near by, but apart from the others, in consequence of the old grudge or feud already mentioned. There is but little difference between this version and the preceding, the act of secession, in both, being voluntary. One singular fact is mentioned by *Vetancurt* (Part II, trat. I, cap. XI, p. 269), namely; that the Tlatilulca made a market-place for *both* parties. Otherwise (p. 257), he concurs with Torquemada. *Granados y Galvez* (Tarde 6a, p. 174), after saying that both "eran deudos y parientes unos con otros" adds "whether this division proceeded from past quarrels, or out of the incommodities which they suffered among canes and reeds; it is certain that they divided peaceably . . ." *Veytia* (Lib. II, cap. XV, pp. 135 and 142), reporting on all the various traditions about the foundation of Tlatilulco, comes to the conclusion that the "nobles" retired to Tlatilulco, whereas the "common people" remained at Mexico. *Clavigero* (Lib. II, cap. XV, p. 178), agrees with Veytia in regard to the real import of the fables told concerning the ancient feuds among the migratory band, but (Cap. XVII, pp. 187 and 188), he accepts the version that these old dissensions were the causes of the final division.

I have not been able, yet, to find whether the seceding Tlatilulca formed one kin, or one brotherhood of kins, or whether they were discontented fractions of kins removing. Had Vetancurt given us the names of the "barrios" of Tlatilulco, we might possibly infer something from them. As it is, the fact of the four "principals" mentioned by Durán, seems to indicate four kins, or rather (perhaps) fractions from four kins, whom want of space probably caused to remove. They may have been crowded out, and in course of time the feeling of jealousy and rivalry sprung up of which the authorities speak both freely and frequently. See *Veytia* (Lib. II, cap. XV, p. 135).

174 Still, this low condition did not remain forever. The Tlatilulca
618 were in a measure "re-adopted" into the tribe. After this, they
[615] formed a fifth quarter, or "phratry," which Father Vetancurt (in 1690) mentions as containing six "parcialidades." But this rehabilitation never extinguished the fire of revenge kindled once among the Tlatilulca towards the Mexicans. The latter treated the former therefore, not as a tribe subject to tribute, but as a suspicious group, to which the rights and privileges resulting from consanguinity could not well be denied, but to which voice and vote in the leading councils should not be accorded. In this singular position, not strictly inferior, but evidently more "distant," we find the Tlatilulca at Mexico at the time of the conquest.[59]

---

or tribes, in which there were of both kinds, were those who divided themselves from the rest." (See note 44.) It is much to be regretted that the eminent Mexican scholar has not given us the names of these "Algunos escritores nacionales modernos."

[59] According to *Durán* (Cap. XXXIV, p. 271), they remained in a degraded condition for 160 days at least, or eight aboriginal months: "y que les turase esta penitencia y castigo hasta los ochenta dias del segundo tributo." But they were, according to him, relieved of it but conditionally: "y asi les quitauan aquellos entredichos que e contado, los quales, en faltándoles, eran tornados á poner." In order to comply with the demands of the Mexicans for slaves, the Tlatilulca were forced to carry arms again, so as to take part in the wars. *Tezozomoc* (Cap. XLVI, p. 75) confirms, but implies previously (p. 75) that the Tlatilulca were specially obligated to be the traders for Mexico: "y haveis de ser nuestros tratantos y mercadres en los tianguis de Huexotzinco, Tlaxcalan, Tlilinquitepec, Zacatlan, y Cholula." A similar punishment was meted out to them by "Stern chief" the younger (the last Montezuma), after an unsuccessful campaign against Huexotzinco, Cholula, and Atlixco. *Durán* (Cap. LIX, pp. 468, 469), *Tezozomoc* (Cap. XCVI, p. 170). It is, besides, positively asserted by the former (p. 271) that the "medicine lodge," or temple of Tlatilulco, was closed thereafter, abandoned and left to ruin and decay ("y asi dice la ystoria questuvo hasta entonces lleno de yerba y de vasura y caidas las paredes y dormitorios del"). It is, of course, confirmed by *Tezozomoc* (p. 75, cap. XLVI): "y asi fué que lo estiuvo muchos años hasta la venida que hizo Don Fernando Cortés, Marquis del Valle, en esta nueva España, como adelante se dirá, á que me refiere." It is somewhat difficult to reconcile these statements with those of *Bernal Diez de Castillo* (Cap. XCII, pp. 88, 89, 90, 91, Vedia, Vol. II), and of *Sr. Icazbalceta* in *Cervantes-Salazar* ("*Tres Dialogos,*" note 40 to 2d
[114] Dial., p. 201) to the effect that Cortes visited that temple of Tlatilulco and found "Stern
chief" worshipping in it, and still more difficult is it to reconcile the relation of Bernal Diez with that of *Andrés de Tapia* ("*Relacion, etc., etc.,*" pp. 562–586, Col. de Doc., II), who, as an eye-witness too, deserves similar credit.

Tlatilulco formed a quarter, a fifth great one, of Mexico at the time of the conquest. This is distinctly stated by *Motolinia* (*Historia, etc.*, Trat. III, cap. VII, pp. 180 and 181), *Torquemada* (Lib. II, cap. XI, p. 93) confirms Motolinia in general, (Lib. III, cap. XXIV, p. 296), *Mendieta* (Lib. III, cap. II, p. 182), "en el barrio llamado Tlatelulco;" (Lib. IV, cap. XV, p. 414), "y el barrio se dice Tlatelulco," adding (p. 418) "que son del mismo pueblo de Tlatelulco;" (Cap. XVII, p. 423), "El convento de Santiago de Tlatelulco que es como barrio de Mexico;" (Cap. XXVIII, p. 466), "pueblo de Tlatelulco;" (Id., p. 463, Cap. XXIX). That this fifth great quarter was again divided into six smaller ones, is proven by *Vetancurt* ("*Crónica, etc.,*" pp. 207 and 212): "Tiene cuatro religiosos que con el ministro colado administran á más de mil quinientas personas en

643 latter led the Mexicans in person, or a substitute for either of them might take the command.[223] During the last days of aboriginal Mexico, when warriors from different tribes, together with the head-chiefs of Tezcuco and of Tlacopan, crowded into the invested pueblo, the so-called "King of Mexico" appeared as the *confederate* commander, while the "snake-woman" only wielded the authority and performed the duties of "captain-general" of the *Mexican* contingent.[224]

All these different attributes may be united in the functions of one office, namely: that of head-chief of the tribe. As such, we must consider the "Cihuacohuatl," and as such was he recognized by Cortés when in 1521, he created the last "snake-woman" "governor" of the remnants of the Mexican tribe and of the so-called Indian wards within which they "were" subsequently settled.[225]

We have seen that the "snake-woman" was the colleague, or associate in matters of tribal importance, of another officer, who had originally filled his place, but whose sphere of action had been so much extended through the formation of the confederacy, that a colleague became needed in tribal affairs. This officer, commonly entitled "King of Mexico," sometimes even "Emperor of Anahuac," was the "chief of men," "Tlaca-tecuhtli".[226]

---

[701] capitanes señalados," and both war-chiefs of Mexico were present and in the field (p. 41). Not to increase the volume of quotations beyond measure, I shall simply add that, as the Cihuacohuatl grew older and could not well go to war, other captains took his place. These captains I will refer to hereafter. *Acosta* (Lib. VII, cap. XVIII).

[223] Evidence to that effect is found in *Durán* (Cap. XXII, p. 189), and especially in *Tezozomoc* (Cap. XLVIII, p. 76): "Cuauhnochtli, capitan general." (Cap. LXXI, LXXII and XCI, pp. 160 and 161, etc., etc.). This explains why the title of chief-commander of the Mexicans is so variously stated. See the very sensible remarks of *Clavigero* (Lib. VII, cap. XXI, p. 494, etc.). These chiefs were, in this instance, temporarily appointed, since it was not the creation of an office, but simply a delegation of power for a certain special purpose. When the foray was over, the charge ceased to exist, the war-chief returning to his original rank.

[224] *Cortés* ("*Carta Tercera*," Vedia I, p. 86): E dende a poco volvió con ellos uno de los mas principales de todos aquellos que se llamaba Ciguacoacin, y era el capitan y gobernador de todos ellos, é por su consejo se seguian todas las cosas de guerra." This fact is generally accepted, and needs no further proof.

[225] *Cortés* ("*Carta Quarta*," Vedia I, p. 110). *Petition to Charles V, by four Indian chiefs of Mexico*, June 16, 1532, in "*Cruautés horribles des Conquérants espagnols*," of Mr. Ternaux-Compans, 1st Series (Appendix, pp. 265, 266 and 269): "Moi, don Hernando de Tapia, je suis fils de Tapia, et ancien Tucotocle, gouverneur de Mexico, sous le marquis del Valle." *Herrera* (Dec. III, lib. IV, cap. VIII, pp. 122 and 123). *Bernal Diez de Castillo* (Cap. CLVII, Vedia II, pp. 198 and 199). *Icazbalceta in Cervántes-Salazar* ("*Tres Diálogos*," Introd. to 2d Dialogue, pp. 75 and 76).

[114] [226] I have used this title, perhaps for the first time among recent writers, in "*Art of War*," (p. 123). *Tezozomoc* (Cap. LXXXIII, p. 145). *Ramirez de Fuenleal* ("Letter,

In the year 1375, according to the Mendoza Codex, the first incumbent of this office was elected by popular vote.[227] From that time on, the office remained strictly elective and non-hereditary, in so far as, like the chief officers of the calpulli, the descendants of the former incumbent were preferred to succeed him; provided they were undoubtedly competent.[228] But no rule of succession

---

etc." in 1st *Recueil* of Ternaux-Compans, p. 247). *Codex Mendoza* (Plate XVIII): "Tlacatectli gobernador" also the "Declaracion de la figurado." *Sahagun* (Lib. VI, cap. XX, pp. 135 and 136). This very remarkable chapter deserves to be closely studied, since it embodies the principles upon which the aborigines of Mexico filled their offices, and the bases of their mode of government. It would be too long to attempt a full analysis of it, and anything short of a careful study would fail to give an adequate conception of its importance. I merely refer to the statements of the celebrated Franciscan in regard to the title under consideration: "porque ya está en la dignidad y estrado, y tiene ya el principal lugar donde le puso nuestro señor? ya le llaman por estos nombres tecatlato, tlacatecutli, por estos nombres le nombran todos los populares . . . ." This passage and the succeeding one: "y alguno de estos tomado de la república por rey y señor," clearly indicate that the title is that of the so-called "King" or "chief of men;" (p. 136); however, he mentions the "tlacatecutli" as one of "dos senadores para lo que toca al regimiento del pueblo." There is an evident contradiction here, which is very similar to the one already noticed in regard to the two sections of the council, in a former note.

[227] *Codex Mendoza* (Plate II). *Mendieta* (Lib. II, cap. XXXIV, p. 148). In regard to this Chronology, compare the late and highly valuable work of *Don M. Orozco y Berra*, ("*Ojeada sobre la Cronologia Mexicana*" in *the* "*Biblioteca Mexicana*,"—an Introduction to a reprint of Tezozomoc). The learned author has brought to light many highly valuable facts. That "Acamapichtli" or "Handful of Reeds" was *elected*, is abundantly proven by many authorities, so that detailed quotations are useless.

[228] The fullest report is contained in *Sahagun* (Lib. VIII, cap. XXX, p. 318): "Cuando moria el señor ó rey para elegir otro, juntábanse los senadores que llamaban tecutlatoque, y tambien los viejos del pueblo que llamaban achcacauhti, y tambien los capitanes soldados viejos de la guerra que llamaban Iauequioaques (should be Iau-Tequioaques), y otros capitanes que eran principales en las cosas de la guerra, y tambien los Sátrapas que llamaban Tlenamacasques ó papaoaque: todos estos se juntaban en las casas reales, y allí deliberaban y determinaban quien habia de ser señor, y escogian uno de los mas nobles de la liné de los señores antepasados, que fuese hombre valiente y ejercitado en las cosas de guerra, osado, animoso, y que no supiese beber vino: que fuese prudente y sábio, y que fuese criado en el Calmecac: que supiese bien hablar, y fuese entendido, recatado y animoso, y cuando todos ó los mas concurrian en uno, luego le nombraban por señor. No se hacia esta eleccion por escrutinio ó por votos, sino todos juntos confiriendo los unos con los otros, venian à concertarse en uno." To this should be added the testimony of the same author (Lib. VI, cap. XX, pp. 135–139). *Durán* (Cap. XI, p. 103): "y es de saver que no ponian hijo del que elexian por rey, ó del que moria, porque como ya tengo dicho, nunca heredaron los hijos, por via de herencia, los ditados ni los señorios, sino por election; y asi, agora fuese hijo, agora fuese hermano, agora primo, como fuese electo por el rey y por los de su consejo para aquel ditado, le era dado, bastaua ser de aquella lingnia y pariente cercano; y asi iban siempre los hijos y los hermanos heredándolo, poco á poco, si no esta vez, la otra, ó si no la otra, y asi nunca salia de aquella generacion aquel ditado y señorio, eligiéndolos poco á poco." (Cap. LXIV, p. 496): "porque en aquel tiempo heredábanse los hermanos hijos del rey unos á otros, aunque de lo que desta hystoria e notado, ni auia herencia ni sucesion, sino solos aquellos que los electores escogian, como fuese hijo ó hermano del que moria, ó sobrino ó primo, en segundo grado, y este órden me parece que llevan en todas sus electiones, y asi creo que muchos de los que claman y piden venllles por herencia los señores, porque en su infidelidad sus padres fueron reyes y señores,

earnestness of his manner which eye-witnesses have mistaken for the haughtiness of a tyrant.[245]

These duties not only necessitated official residence at the "official house," but even permanent stay there, unless important business required the chief's absence.[246] Such absence, however, could only be justified by official duties, and then the "chief of men" had to appear with all the tokens and emblems of his rank.[247] If otherwise, he might indeed, go about, but he lost all claim to official recognition.[248] Hence the statements are true in the main, however exaggerated in detail, that great decorum was observed towards the "chief of men" whenever he appeared in public, that he was addressed with marked deference, and that a certain pomp surrounded him on such occasions.[249] These occasions were, of course, opportunities for the display of Indian

---

Walter Scott in "Waverley." As to the part played by the "chief of men" see particularly *Bernal Diez* (Cap. XCI, p. 88, Vedia II).

[245] This particularly earnest mien is noticed by all authors. It is strictly Indian, and found among the rudest tribes.

[246] *Durán* (Cap. XXVI. p. 214): "Y asi, lo primero que se ordenó, fué que los reyes nunca saliesen en público, sino á cosas muy necesarias y forçosas." *Codice Ramirez* (p. 76): "De ordinario estaba retirado saliendo muy pocas vezes á vista del pueblo."

[247] *Durán* (Cap. XXVI, p. 214), *Sahagun* (Lib. VIII, cap. X, p. 291). It is distinctly asserted by the former that, what he has called "corona real" could only be worn by the "chief of men" and the "snake-woman." This head-dress, very appropriately termed by the Spaniards, "half mitre" ("media mitra") is figured by many authors of native origin. See *Codex Mendoza* (plates II to XIV, also LXX), *Durán* (*Láminas* 2 to 14, also 16. 18. to 24 etc.), *Codice Ramirez* (plates 4 and 5). It is called "Xiuhuitzolli" by the Mexicans. See also *Molina* (Parte Ia, p. 30 and IIa, p. 160) from "Xiuitl" turquoise or green stone, and is totally different from the head-dress worn by the "chief of men" in the field. Compare "*Art of War*" (p. 128). [243]

[248] This explains the stories about the "incognito" ramblings of "Fasting Wolf" of Tezcuco. so frequently repeated after the Ixtlilxochitls, as well as that of the arrest of "Wrathy Chief" (the last Montezuma) for appropriating corn out of a field. The latter tale is beautifully told by *H. H. Bancroft* (Vol. II, pp. 451, 452) after the best authorities.

[249] No author has been more prolific in pictures of pomp, regal wealth and magnificence, than *Bernal Diez de Castillo* ("*Historia verdadera*," etc., etc., Cap. LXXXVIII, XCI and XCII, etc.). Most of the later writers have placed undue reliance on his statements, assuming that the truthfulness with which he "gave vent" to his own individual feelings and impressions, was the result of cool, impassionate observation. Anyone who has read attentively (and not merely glanced over at random for the purpose of obtaining quotations) his protracted "Mémoires," will become convinced that he is, in fact, one of the most unreliable eye-witnesses, as far as general principles are concerned. In every detail where his personal feelings are not involved or by which, even at the late date when he wrote, they were not involuntarily aroused, he is much more trustworthy than when he takes special pride or pains to be very explicit. Thus, it is curious to compare his description of "Wrathy Chief's" reception of Cortés with that given subsequently by the "Marquis del Valle" himself, ("*Carta Segunda*," Vedia I, p. 23). It was doubtlessly the greatest effort at pomp and display ever attempted by the Mexicans, since they went to meet and greet the most incom- [114]

643 finery, when a number of articles were used to deck the "chief
644 of men" as his official insignia, but the custom of speaking to

114 prehensible beings ever heard of by them. It is interesting to place both versions side by side. The translation is my own and I therefore beg for indulgence.

Cortés. Second Dispatch.

"At that place more than a thousand principal people came to greet and to speak to me, all citizens of the said city, and all dressed alike and according to their custom very richly, and when they [576] came to speak to me, every one of them made, before coming up, a particular ceremony, customary among them, which consisted in each one of them putting his hand on the ground, kissing it; and in this manner I waited almost an hour until each one had made his ceremony." "...... After we had passed that bridge, this lord Muteczuma came to receive us with about two hundred Lords, all barefooted and dressed in other livery or manner of clothing, also very rich after their custom, and more so than that of the others. They came in two processions, closely hugging the walls of the street which is very broad, fine, and straight, so that from one end of it the other end may be seen, and two-thirds of a league ("legua") in length, with very good buildings on both sides, dwellings as well as temples. And the said Muteczuma went in the middle of the street with two chiefs, one to his right and the other to his left. One of these was the same one who, as I said, had come to speak to me in the litter, and the other was the said Muteczuma's brother, lord of that city of Iztapalapa which I had left that day. All three were dressed alike, except Muteczuma who wore soles to his feet, whereas the other two chiefs had none and supported him by his arms........."

Bernal Diaz de Castillo. Cap. 88.

"When we reached the place where another pathway (dyke) branched off to Cuyoacan, ... many principals and caciques came, covered with very rich mantles, with ornaments and liveries, those of one cacique different from those of another, and the dykes were filled by them. These great caciques were sent by the great Montezuma ahead to receive us, and as they arrived before Cortés they bid us welcome, touching the ground and kissing it in token thereof." "Thus we were detained a good while, and from there the Cacamacan, chief of Tezcuco, and the chief of Iztapalapa, and the chief of Tacuba and the chief of Cuyoacan went forward to meet the great Montezuma who approached in a rich litter, accompanied by other great Lords and caciques holding vassals. And when we neared Mexico, where there were other small towers, the great Montezuma descended from his litter, and these great caciques took hold of his arms, advancing with him under a marvellously rich canopy of green plumes with large golden ornaments, much silver, and pearls and stones of "Chalchihuis" suspended from it as fringes, and very dazzling to the eye. The great Montezuma was very richly dressed after their custom, with cotarас on his feet (as they are called), with golden soles and much jewelry over them. The four lords who came with him were also richly dressed, though not in the same manner as when they had come out to receive us,—as if they changed dress on purpose under way. Besides these Lords, there came other great caciques who bore the canopy over their heads, and other many Lords preceded the great Montezuma sweeping the ground before him and placing ropes for him to step upon. None of these Lords ventured to look him in the face, but all had their eyes cast down, except those of his relatives and nephews who supported him by the arms.

him with downcast eyes was not so much a mark of particular 643
respect, as a thoroughly Indian habit of shy suspicion, common 644

A third eye-witness, *Andrés de Tápia* ("*Relacion*," etc., Col. de Doc's, II, p. 579), 114
simply says: "The said Muteczuma went in the middle of the street, and all the rest of the people were along the walls, close to them, as such is their custom."

The version of Bernal Dies is corroborated by *Oviedo* ("*Hist. general*," etc., Lib. XXXIII, cap. XLV, p. 509), from information derived by him of "some knights and soldiers who had taken part in the conquest of New Spain" (Title of Chapter XLV, p. 494). But the old chronicler does not give the names of his informants.

The same question recurs here, which we have already discussed in regard to the fights with the Tlaxcalteca ("*Art of War*," p. 155, note 293), and here again we reach the same conclusion namely: that Bernal *Diez* de Castillo, "bent upon recollecting personal incidents, and, from his subaltern position" less able to see closely, in this instance, magnifies the importance of the action beyond the limits of truth.

It is easily noticed, how much more sober, and therefore less pompous, are the statements of the Spanish commander and of his lieutenant, than those of the common soldiers, including Oviedo's anonymous informants. And it should be remembered that Cortés, who was the chief actor in the scene, certainly saw *more* of it and saw it far better than any of the others. Furthermore, at the time he wrote his report (the 30 of October, 1520, or only about one year after the date of the occurrence), Cortés had personal and political motives to magnify and embellish the picture. If his statements, therefore, fall far below those of his troopers in thrilling and highly colored details, there is every reason to believe that they are the more reliable and trustworthy.

Referring, therefore, to the description by Cortés, we find, on the whole, nothing but a barbarous display common to other Indian celebrations of a similar character. Of the Mexicans themselves, a number of such receptions are related by aboriginal authors. I particularly refer to *Tezozomoc* ("*Crónica*," etc., Cap. XXVII, pp. 41 and 42). 727
Upon the return of the Mexicans from their successful raid on Tecamachalco and 114
Tepeaca: "the Mexicans were received in triumph, with horns, trumpets (?), flowers, and frankincense. The old men of the tribe, carrying censers and roses, stood in two rows on each side of the way, their hair tied on the back of their heads with strips of red leather, called cuauhtlalpiloni, with shields in their hands, rods—cuauhtopilli,—and rattles, in token of old age and of being fathers to such braves. Between them the Mexican troop had to pass,—and these are called cuacuacuiltzin,—taking in the middle the captains, and the prisoners which they had brought from the four pueblos;" also (Cap. XXIX), though it is less explicit, about the return from the foray against the Huaxtecas; (Cap. XXXVIII p. 62), speaking of the return from the foray against Huaxaca: "Then Moctezuma commanded to all the old men and to the principal Mexicans to go out and receive the returning warriors with much mirth and joy. They met them in the road, and greeted them, incensing them with much copal, which is like unto myrrh, and a mark of great honor, token of triumph in war;" (Cap. XLIX, p. 79): "At Mazatzintamalco (which has since become garden of the Marquis del Valle), the old men, Cuauhuehueques, and the Mexican council were arrayed in line to receive him, each one with his calabash-rattle, and armed with shields and macanas, wearing ichcahuipiles, and with the hair tied up on the back of the head with straps of red leather. Along the road there were, at intervals, bowers and huts decked with roses, and the old men joined the procession which moved into México-Tenochtitlan, directly up to the temple of *Huitzilopochtli*." This was when "*Face in the Water*" returned from the raid against the Matlatzincas;—(Cap. LII, p. 85) when the same "chief of men" returned, beaten and defeated by the Tarasca of Michhuacan, the same reception was made to him, only with groans, and wails of grief and mourning; also (Cap. LVIII, p. 96, Cap. LXII, p. 104, etc., etc.). It follows from the above that the reception of Cortés and whatever barbarous display attended it, was strictly according to established custom. Similar receptions were made to trading companies returning
with particular success. *Sahagun* (Lib. IX, cap. II, p. 339). "They went in pro- 114
cession like two files, one of priests and the other of chiefs, and they met them in 576

643 even now to much ruder tribes;[250] and the ornaments and peculiar
644 garments, like the head-dress so very appropriately designated by the Spaniards as a "half-mitre," and other articles already described by us on a former occasion were not worn by him alone, as the "Cihuacohuatl" enjoyed the same privilege.[251] This, and the burial-rites to which we cannot, here, refer in detail,[252]

---

114 the pueblo of Acachinanco," to the south of Mexico, in the direction of San Antonio
576 Abad, says *Bustamante* (note a). This was while "Water-Rat" was "chief of men." That the "chief of men" moved alone, or with a small escort only, in the middle of the street, is very natural. He was the head of the official household and the chief war-captain of the confederacy. His particular duty it was, therefore, to greet the strangers. On any ordinary occasion it would have been misplaced, and against all rules of Indian etiquette, for the chief-officers of a tribe to go out to meet them; but in this case, wavering between fear and curiosity, an exception was made. It is worthy of remark that even when the "chief of men" returned at the head of a victorious war-party, the "snake-woman" is not mentioned as sallying forth to greet him in person.

576 [250] This custom of addressing people to whom some deference is due, has been
171 noticed among numerous tribes of America. Among the Mexicans it was not at all an exclusive mark of deference towards the chief-officer. His interlocutors did not look at *him*, neither did he look at *them*. See *Bernal Diez* (Cap. XCI, p. 86, Vedia II), *Clavigero* (Lib. VII, cap. XI, p. 470). The latter is particularly important, although he but copies *Torquemada* (Lib. XIV, cap. I, p. 535) in the main. As far as other tribes are concerned, I but recall here the Peruvian "Inca." See *Francisco de Jerez* ("*Verdadera Relacion de la Conquista del Perú y Provincia del Cuzco llamada la Nueva Castilla*," etc., etc., in Vedia, Vol. *II*, p. 331), when Hernando Pizarro met Atahuallpa for the first time: "los ojos puestos en tierra, sin los alzar á mirar á ninguna parte." Of the Indians of the gulf states of North America, it is said by *James Adair* ("*History of the American Indians*," p. 4): "They are timorous, and consequently cautious, ... exceedingly modest in their behaviour." See also on the Northern Indians, *Loskiel* ("*Geschichte der Mission der evangelischen Brüder*," Barby 1789, pp. 17 and 18). It would be superfluous to add further quotations.

[251] *Durán* (Cap. XXVI, p. 215, cap. XLIV, p. 357). *Tezozomoc* (Cap. XXXVI, p. 57, cap. LXIX, p. 115, etc.). *Durán* (Lámina 8, Trat 1°).

764 [252] That the burial of the "Cihuacohuatl" took place after the same manner as that of the "Tlaca-tecuhtli," is proven by the "*Codice Ramirez*" (p. 67): "Hiziéronse obsequias solemnisimas y un enterramiento mas sumptuoso que el de los Reyes pasados, porque todos lo tenian por el amparo, y muro fuerte del gran imperio Mexicano." *Durán* (Cap. XLVIII, pp. 381 and 382): "el qual despues de muerto, su cuerpo fué quemado y sus cenizas enterradas junto á los sepulcros de los Reyes, haciéndole las exequias conforme á persona tal se deuian, de la mesma manera que á los reyes se hacian y sus grandeças pedian." *Acosta* (Lib. VII, cap. XVIII, p. 496): "le hicieron exequias los Mexicanos, con mas aparato y demostracion que á ninguno de los Reyes auian hecho."

In connection with the burial rites it may be in place, here, to refer to a custom easily interpreted in favor of the assumption, that the "Tlaca-tecuhtli" was a monarch. It is the carving, in the live rock at Chapultepec near Mexico, of human shapes commemorative (or at least said to be) of each of these officers, towards the close of each one's lifetime. There can be no doubt as to the existence of such carvings. The last of them, representing "Wrathy chief," was seen by *Don Antonio de Leon y Gama* ("*Descripcion Histórica y Cronológica de las dos Piedras que con ocasion del Nuevo Empedrado que se esta formando en la Plaza principal de Mexico, se hallaron en ella el Año de 1790*," Segunda Edicion; 1832, Parte Segunda, pp. 80 and 81), as late as 1753 or 1754, when it was destroyed ("picada") by order of the authorities. Another figure, intended for count are interspersed the characters of the year-count; that is, those four characters mentioned above, which are Reed, Flint Knife, House, and Rabbit, by which they counted the hebdomad of their years, which is fifty-two.

This very pernicious count, superstitious, and full of idolatry, as is to be seen in this Fourth Book, some praise highly, saying that it was very ingenious and contained no blemish. This they said because they did not understand for what purpose this count, which is very evil and idolatrous, was established. Little did they appreciate the multitude of superstitions, feasts, and idolatrous sacrifices involved in it. And they called this count the calendar of the Indians, not understanding that this count doth not extend through all of the year; because it hath only two hundred and sixty days in its round, and then cometh back to its beginning. And so it cannot be and never was a calendar; for the calendar, as hath been said, is represented in the opening of the Second Book, and containeth all the days of the year, and [all] the feasts of the year. And this they who say that this soothsaying art is a calendar, do not know. And surely it was great carelessness and culpable ignorance to praise by word of mouth and in writing something so evil and full of idolatry.

The zeal for truth and for the Catholic Faith compels me to place here the very words of a treatise which a member of one of the religious Orders wrote in praise of this art of soothsaying, declaring that it is a calendar; so that wherever one may see it, he may know that it is something very pernicious to our holy Catholic Faith; and it may be destroyed and burned.

The following is the introduction of the aforementioned treatise.

Introduction and explanation, newly made, of the calendar of the Indians of Anauac, that is, of New Spain.

By means of the wheels reproduced above, the Indians count their days, weeks, months, years, olympiads, five-year periods, indictions, and hebdomads, starting their year, like ours, with the beginning of January. In [their system] are found the means of reckoning time which all nations have had. And as is seen, the Indians who established and knew it well certainly showed themselves to be natural philosophers. They were at fault only as to the leap year.

pedernal, casa, conejo, por donde contauan la hebdomada de sus años, que son cincuenta y dos. 805 212 787x

Esta cuenta muy perjudicial, y muy supersticiosa, y muy llena de idolatria, como parece en este libro quarto, algunos la alaban mucho: diziendo, que era muy ingenjosa y que njnguna macula tenja, esto dixerõ por no entender a que fin se endereza, esta cuenta el qual es muy malo ydolatrico de poco entendieron la muchedumbre de supersticiones y fiestas y sacrificios idolatricos, que en ella se contienen, y llamaron a esta cuenta, el calendario de los indios: no entendiendo que esta cuenta no alcança a todo el año, porque no tiene mas docientos y sesenta dias de circulo, y luego torna a su principio, y ansi no puede ser calendario y nj nunca lo fue, porque el calendario, como esta dicho, y esta pintado, en el principio del segundo libro, contiene todos los dias del año, y las fiestas del año: y esto ignoraron los que dizen que esta arte adiujnatoria es calendario: y cierto fue grande inaduertencia, y culpable ignorancia loar por palabra, y por escrito vna cosa tan mala y tan llena de idolatria. 805 787x

El zelo de la verdad, y de la fe catholica, me compele a poner aquj, las mjsmas palabras de vn tratado, que vn religioso escriujo en loor desta arte adiujnatoria; diziendo que es calendario, para que dondequjera que alguno le viere, sepa que es cosa muy perjudicial, a nuestra sancta fe catholica, y sea destruydo, y quemado. 805 114●

Siguese la introducion del tractado sobredicho.

Introducion, i declaracion nueuamente sacada, que es el calendario de los indios de Anaoac, esto es de la nueua españa.

Por las ruedas aquj antepuestas, cuentan los indios sus dias, semanas, meses, años, olimpiadas lustros indiciones, y hebdomadas: començando su año, con el nuestro desde el principio de henero: en la qual se hallan las maneras de contar los tiempos que tujeron todas las naciones, y segun parece los indios que la composieron, y sabian bien, ciertamente se mostraron philosophos naturales, solamente faltaron en el bixesto: pero tambien paso el gran philosopho

805

114

But this was the case also as to the great philosopher Aristotle and his teacher Plato, and many other wise men who did not attain [knowledge of] it. And it should be known that in this calendar there is nothing idolatrous; and this is praiseworthy for many reasons, but to mention one will be enough. And it is that in this land it was not very many years ago that idolatry began. And this calendar is exceedingly ancient, and if the names of the days, weeks, and years, and their representations, are of animals and beasts, and other creatures, it is nothing to wonder at; for if we look at ours, they also are of planets and of gods which the pagans had. Even if many rites, falsehoods, and ancient sacrifices are written of here [in connection with] a thing so good, of such excellence and truth as these natives possessed, there is no reason to condemn it. For we know that all good and truth, no matter who expresseth it, is of the Holy Ghost.

Refutation of the above[1]

As to what he first saith, that by means of this count the Indians reckoned [their] weeks, months, and years: this is most false. For this count containeth only two hundred and sixty days, and lacketh one hundred and five days to be the count of an entire year. Neither did they reckon their months by this count, because their months are eighteen in a year, and each one hath twenty days, which maketh three hundred and sixty days. This count doth not reach that number. Neither do they reckon their weeks by this count; for what they say, that they had thirteen days in a week, is false, because thus there would be a week of thirteen days and another week [which] would go into the next month with three days,[2] and so no month would have two entire weeks. But more important, their weeks were of five days, which were better called five-day periods than weeks, and there are in each month four of these five-day periods.

What he saith of olympiads, five-year periods, indictions, and the like, is false and pure invention.

What he saith, that the year started in January, like ours, is most incorrect; for what they call a year by this count is of only two hundred and sixty days,

Aristotiles, y su maestro platon, y otros muchos sabios que no lo alcançaron. Y es de saber, que en este calendario, no ay cosa de idolatria: y esto se poede de alabar, por muchas razones, pero bastara dezir vna: y es que en esta tierra no ha muy muchos años, que començaron las idolatrias: y este calendario es antiquissimo y si los nombres de los dias, semanas, y años, y sus figuras, son de anjmales, y de bestias, y de otras criaturas; no se deuen maraujllar, pues si mjramos los nuestros: tambien son de planetas, y de dioses que los gentiles tuujeron: y pues que aquj se escriuen muchos ritos, ficciones, y antiguos sacrificios, vna cosa tan buena, y de tanto primor, y verdadera que estos naturales tuujeron: no es razon de reprobarla: pues sabemos que todo bien y verdad, qujenqujera que la diga, es del espiritu sancto.

Confutacion de lo arriba dicho.

En lo primero que dize, que por esta cuenta: los indios contauan seis [*sic*] semanas, meses, y años, es falsissimo: porque esta cuenta no contiene mas doscientos y sesenta dias, y faltale ciento y cinco dias, para ser cuenta de vn año entero; nj tanpoco contauan sus meses por esta cuenta, porque sus meses son deziocho en vn año, y cada vno tiene viente dias que son trezientos y sesenta dias; al qual numero, no llega esta cuenta; nj tampoco cuentan, por esta cuenta sus semanas, porque aquello que dizen, que tenjan treze dias por semana es falso, porque desta manera seria vna semana de treze dias, y otra semana entredia con tres dias en el mes sigujente, y ansi cada mes no tendria dos semanas enteras: mayormente, que sus semanas eran de cinco dias las quales mejor se llamaran quintanas, que no semanas, y ay en cada mes quatro destas quintanas.

Lo que dize de Olimpiades, y lustros, y indiciones o la mesma razon es falso, y mera ficciõ.

Lo que dize, que el año, comencaua [*sic*] en Enero, como el nuestro, es falsissimo: porque lo que llaman vn año por esta cuenta no son mas doscientos y sesenta

---

[1] On the controversy between Sahagún and Motolinía regarding the nature of the calendar, see L. Nicolau d'Olwer: *Fray Toribio de Benavente (Motolinía): Relaciones de la Nueva España* (México: Ediciones de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma, 1956), pp. LV-LVI.

[2] Sahagún (Garibay ed.), IV, Ap. 6, has *entrada*. Santamaría, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 612, defines *entrada*, as used in Cuba, by saying "*Dícese . . . de cualquier momento del día solar.*"

and of necessity it would have to end one hundred and five days before our year. And so it could not start with our year, except with some, and very rarely.

As to what he saith, that the Indians [who] devised this count showed themselves to be natural philosophers: this is most false. For they do not carry out this count according to any natural order; for it was an invention of the devil and an art of soothsaying.

As to what he saith, that they lacked the leap year, it is wrong; because in the count which may be called a true calendar they count three hundred and sixty-five days, and once every four years they counted three hundred and sixty-six days with a feast which for this reason they observed every four years.

As to what he saith, that in this calendar there is no idolatry, it is a very great lie. For it is no calendar but a soothsaying device in which are contained a great deal of idolatry, many superstitions, and many invocations to the demons, tacitly and openly, as is shown in all of this preceding Fourth Book. So that the treatise aforementioned, which that member of a religious Order wrote, containeth no truth but rather very pernicious error and falsehood.

The treatise by that member of a religious Order proceedeth.

The Indians who well understood the secrets of these wheels and calendar showed and explained them to but few, because through their knowledge they gained their livelihood and were held in esteem and considered wise and intelligent. Nevertheless, almost all adult Indians knew and were informed about the year, as to both the number and house in which they were. But of the names of the days and weeks, and many other secrets and counts which they possessed, only those masters who worked with them attained knowledge.

Now, in order to understand the count which these natives had, in order to know how they kept a time-count by means of the wheels and figures here recorded, rules are given. These are written below.

Refutation of the above.

It is already said that the calendar is different from this count and hath nothing in common with it. The calendar dealeth with the months of the whole year, the days of the whole year, the weeks of the

dias, y de necesidad se avia de acabar ciento y cinco dias, antes de nuestro año: y ansi no podia començar con el nuestro año, si no algunas y muy raro:

en lo que dize que los indios se composiero desta cuenta, se mostraron philosophos naturales, es falsissimo: porque esta cuenta, no le lleuan por njnguna orden natural: porque fue invencion del demonjo, y arte de adiujnacion,

en lo que dize que faltaron en el bixesto es falso, porque en la cuenta que se llama, calendario verdadero, cuentan trescientos y sesenta y cinco dias, y cada quatro años, contauan trecientos, y sesenta y seis dias en fiesta, que para esto hazian de quatro en quatro años.

En lo que dize que en este calendario no ay cosa de idolatria, es falsissima mẽtira: porque no es calendario, sino arte adiujnatoria, donde se contienen, muchas cosas de idolatria, y muchas supersticiones, y muchas invocaciones de los demonjos, tacita, y espressamente, como parece en todo este quarto libro precediente: de manera que ninguna verdad contiene aquel tratado arriba puesto: que aquel religioso escriujo, mas antes cõtiene falsedad y mentira muy pernjciosa.

Siguese adelante en el tratado de aquel religioso.

Los indios, que bien entendian los secretos destas ruedas, y calendario, no los enseñauan, nj descubrian, sino a muy pocos, porque por ello ganauan de comer, y eran estimados, y tenjdos por hombres sabios, y entendidos, empero sabian casi todos los indios adultos y tenjan noticia del año, ansi del numero como de la casa en que andauan: mas de los nombres de los dias, y semanas, y otros muchos secretos, y cuentas que tenjañ: solos aquellos maestros compotistas, lo alcançauanla de saber.

Agora para entender la cuenta, que estos naturales tenjan, y para saber, como contauan los tiempos: por las ruedas, y figuras aquj escritas: se ponen reglas, que son las infra escritas.

Confutacion de lo arriba dicho.

Ya esta dicho, que el calendario es distincto desta cuenta, y no tiene nada que ver con ella. Y el calendario tracta de los meses de todo el año, y de los dias de todo el año, y de las semanas de todo el año, y de las

805 114 whole year, and the fixed feasts of the whole year. All the priests and servants of the idols knew it, as well as many of the populace, because it is a simple matter which toucheth all. But the count of the soothsaying art, which he wrongly calleth a calendar, is a particular kind of count, because its purpose was established to foretell circumstances and events to befall those born under each sign or character. This count only the soothsayers and those who had the skill to learn it, knew; because it containeth many difficulties and obscurities. Those who knew this count they called *tonalpouhque;* they esteemed and honored them greatly. They considered them to be prophets and knowers of future things. Hence they depended upon them for many things, as in days of old the sons of Israel depended upon the prophets.

This [author] saith that the months are twenty in a year. This is not true, for there are only eighteen. Likewise he saith that the weeks are of thirteen days, and this is not true, for they are of only five days, so that there are four weeks or rather five-day periods in a month. The thirteen days which he wrongly calleth a week are only the number of days in which each of the twenty characters in this soothsaying art reigned, as is made clear in the preceding Fourth Book, which dealeth with this soothsaying art.

The chart and [explanation of] the manner of counting used by the soothsayers for this art, now follow.

To the reader.

805 This chart[1] before the friendly reader is the count of the characters or signs with which we have dealt in this Fourth Book. It proceedeth in this order. First are placed twenty characters, and by them their names; and after them are placed the days over which they reign, in numerical notation; and it beginneth one, two, three, etc. The character by or facing the number one reigneth over those thirteen days [beginning with it], and the counting is started from above to below. Reaching thirteen, one then returneth to the number one, and the character before which that number one standeth, reigneth during the thirteen following days. And so with all the remaining numbers and characters. So each one of the characters cometh to reign for thirteen days, and the number of all of these days is two hundred and sixty. From there it returneth again to the beginning.

fiestas fixas de todo el año: sabianle todos los satrapas, y todos los mjnjstros de los idolos, y mucha de la otra gente popular, porque es cosa facil, y toca a todos. Empero la cuenta de la arte adiujnatoria, a la qual falsamente llama calendario, es cuenta por si, porque su fin, se endereza a adiujnar las condiciones, y sucessos de los que nacen en cada signo, o caracter; esta cuenta sabianla solamẽte los adiujnos, y los que tenian abilidad, para deprenderla porque contiene muchas dificultades, y obscuridades: y a estos que sabiã esta cuenta, llamauanlos Tonalpouhque y tenjanlos en mucho y honrauanlos mucho: tenjanlos como prophetas, y sabidores de las cosas futuras, y ansi acudian a ellos, en muchas cosas, como antiguamente los hijos de Israel, acudian a los prophetas,

dize este; que los meses, son viente en vn año, y no es verdad, porque no son mas de deziocho: dize ansimjsmo que las semanas, son de treze dias, y no es verdad: porque no son mas de a cinco dias, y ansi son quatro semanas o por mejor dezir qujntanas en vn mes: los treze dias, a que falsamente llama semana, no son, sino el numero de dias, que reynaua cada vno de los veinte caracteres, desta arte adiujnatoria, como esta claro, en el quarto libro precedente, que tracta desta arte adiujnatoria.

Siguese la tabla y manera de contar que tenjan los adiujnos en esta arte.

Al lector.

Esta tabla, que esta frontera Amigo lector, es la cuenta de los caracteres, o signos de que en este quarto libro auemos tractado, la qual procede por esta orden, que primeramente se ponen viente caracteres, y junto a ellos sus nombres, y despues dellos se ponen los dias, en que reinan por cifras del alguarismo: y comjença, vno, dos, tres, &c. El caracter donde esta junto el vno o frontero del, es el que reina aquellos treze dias, y comjençase a contar desde arriba hazia abaxo: y llegando a treze luego buelue a vno, y el caracter en frente de qujen esta aquel vno, es el que reina los treze dias que se siguen: y ansi de todos los demas numeros y caracteres. De manera, que cada vn caracter viene a reinar treze dias, y el numero de todos estos dias son dozientos y sesenta, y de alli buelue otra vez al principio.

---

[1] See Plate 102.

^[See p. 126a, cat. 116.—Analyst]